

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3	190731		Bellingham	WA
4	Letter on file.			
5	191241		Seattle	WA
6	My interest in the GMP is it's effect on the Lake Ozette Region of the park. Lake Ozette's health is directly related to it's watershed. When you look at the eastern and southern shore of the lake to the ridges a few miles away, it is almost completely clear cut, right down to 150' in some places to the lake. By placing as much of the Ozette watershed into O.N.P. as possible, by working with willing sellers and in cooperatino with other government agencys controlling the land in the watershed, we could help presuvre one of the last large pieces of temperant coastal forest on the west coast of the U.S. Con.			
7	This is essential for the health of the endangered Ozette Sockeye salmon run by raising the water quality of the lake and it's tributaries. This would also protect habitat for the marbled murrelet and the northern spotted owl and its ecosystem in general.			
8	The viewshed is also dramatically compromised by the clear cuts surrounding the lake on the north, east, and south sides.			
9	This is a golden opportunity to expand O.N.P. in a way that would benefit the entire ecosystem of this spectacular but fragile part of our country.			
10	I would like to encourage the choice of Alternative D for the future of Olympic National Park.			
11	191157		Baltimore	MD
12	Letter on File			
13	191214		Port Angeles	WA
14	I am firmly against ONP's plan to expand their boundaries for at least two reasons.			
15				
16	First: I do not believe ONP is efficiently managing the land they already have so how can they expect to manage any more. Time and time again, I read that ONP is closing trails because they are not able to maintain them, or closing campgrounds for lack of money.			
17				
18	Second: I don't believe it is in the Olympic Peninsula's best interest economically to take land from private timber owners and put it under federal regulations. It will become much harder to put up a timber sale with the stiffer regulations and this can only do away with many family wage jobs. Tourism does bring service jobs, but at low pay with no benefits, and it is not possible to raise a family on those kinds of wages.			
19	I have lived in Port Angeles and Elwha Valley for 64 years, and have seen many changes. There are some changes that I have come to accept but this change is not acceptable to me or my family.			
20	190635		Olympia	WA
21	I support more recreational activites that do not have a significant adverse impact. More and better improved hiking trails - with trailheads from deeper into the park. Fix the trails you have; sooner (Staircase). Please do not allow any off road vehicles on any of the trails. Please allow dogs on some trails, for example trails that you allow stock. Please also allow unleashed dogs in camp sites. I support increasing the amount of trails open to mountain bikes. You do not need to increase skiing on Hurricane Ridge. There are plenty of much better skiing opportunities in the Cascades. A ski resort in a remote national park whose primary asset is solitude and natural beauty is really kind of stupid and that comes from a guy who loves to snowboard. You do not need motorized boating. It would be nice to have more lodging (that allows dogs) and more parking/better road access. Trail head improvements. Increased beach access. INCREASED STAFFING.			
22	190799		Port Angeles	WA
23	I have a dream.			
24	I have a dream that one day our government will stop trying to take away the rights of its people.			
25				
26	In 1976, I purchased a piece of lakefront property from my father with the dream of building a cabin on it for my use, my children's use, and my children's children for generation. It's a beautiful spot, but it's only accessible by boat. We have used our boat to build this dream. We need our motorized boat for emergency and safety reasons while at our cabin, as well as the only real way to transport people and supplies to it. Now, our government agencies are trying to take this dream away? Where are my rights? Where are my rights as an American citizen...the ones which I fought for and risked my life for?			
27	Lake Ozette is not a wilderness area. It has always had citizens who owned properties and homesteads around its shores. These citizens have the rights to have what belongs to them, and free access to their ownerships.			
28	What is our government doing to us? Where are my rights? Please protect my rights as a citizen and private property owner, and protect my dream.			
29	190833		Port	WA

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
30	I am writing you to express my sincere concerns about the proposals in the General Management Plan presented by our National Park Service. My biggest concern is why the government is striving to take away the rights of its citizens who own their own properties.		Angeles	
31				
32	We have a property on Lake Ozette that has been in our family for generations. We have spent many years of very hard work building a cabin on this property, which can only be accessed by boat. We absolutely must have the use of a motorized boat in order to finish and maintain our property, as well as, and most importantly, maintain the safety of getting quickly and efficiently to road access for any type of an emergency...this is imperative.			
33				
34	Please leave things as they are.			
35				
36	Do not keep taking away our rights.			
37				
38	190901		Port Angeles	WA
39	I consider myself to be a conservationist and am a nature lover who is extremely concerned about the National Parks plan to expand its boundaries and further limit the use of Lake Ozette and the ocean beaches accessed by trail from the lake.			
40				
41	In the years since I grew up at Ozette, use has become more and more restricted by the Park. The lake is the largest natural lake in Washington state, with no road access around the better part of its banks, yet there are only one or two areas left for swimming or picnicking. The others have become overgrown with weeds because the Park has blocked them from use. Now they want to restrict even more and also buy more land. Even the ocean beaches to which we could hike via the lake are scheduled to be further restricted. What good is a park if you can't take a walk, have a picnic, swim, boat, or fish? As for the fishing, the seals that are protected by the Park are allowed to come up the rivers into the lake and eat as many fish as they want. Are the beaches and lake only for a select few? What about the older folk, children, and the rest of us?			
42				
43	The Park also wants to purchase more land and extend its boundaries. They've built extravagant buildings at Ozette. For example, the restroom facilities are so huge that the ceilings could accomodate a second story. Why does the Park have so much money for pretentious buildings and land acquisitions, yet they profess to be broke and must charge "Park Entrance" fees and parking fees (in a field that's been there since it was homesteaded).			
44				
45	Most folks who grew up at Lake Ozette came from families who had homesteaded there. We didn't have a lot of money or access to city entertainment, but immersed in the beauty of nature, we never felt poor. If the Park has its way, only a fortunate few will view those view, breathe that air, and listen to that music.			
46	190524		Arlington	WA
47	We want to comment on future plans for the ONP.			
48				
49	In our opinion the focus should be on protecting threatened ecosystems and wildlife. Restoring or enhancing opportunities for threatened wildlife should be a priority. We support increased park boundaries to protect critical habitat, especially Ozette Lake, Queets, Lake Crescent, and Quinalt watersheds. We are stunned to see the extent of logging around the perimeter of the park.			
50				
51	We strongly oppose more 'development" such as more roads or campgrounds. there is plenty of room outside the park for commercial development.			
52	190965		Olympia	WA
53	Considering the emphasis on multiple-use and recreation on private, state, and US Forest Service Land, I find it important that the Park Service concentrates on protecting the biological resource. I support the selection of Alternative B over Alternative D for these very reasons.			
54				
55	The development of additional recreation compromises our ability to sustain important ecosystems and biological functions especially in the lower elevations and riparian areas. We should not compromise the biological integrity of the Olympic National Park in the name of roads, recreation, or corporate contractors. I feel that we can concede some environmental quality to sustain some local businesses, but the Park Service should mitigate and reduce the environmental impacts to the lowest possible levels.			
56				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
57	Protection of our rivers and waterways in the park is crucial, especially if we have any chance of saving federally threatened salmon. Please include wild and scenic designations for the rivers in the park and select the correct protection and management measures to fulfill the wild and scenic designation. Olympic National Park should lead the way in salmon recovery and set an example for the rest of Puget Sound and the Straight of Juan de Fuca. The Elwha River is a good place to start and if we can nurture this river with two dams to wild and scenic designation, other rivers should be simpler. All it takes is the will from the Park Service and the proper protection of streams. Let us make road access second to our salmon recovery efforts. I recommend that the Park Service not reopen Dosewallips road and it could serve as an area for non-motorized vehicle travel, popular in some seasons in some other parks.				
58					
59	I also appreciate the efforts proposed in the marine intertidal reserves along the coast and the proposal to relocate Kalaloch Lodge. Other areas of concerns include the lower elevation riparian areas that we rarely leave untouched because of their easy access. We have plenty of development in the lower elevation and riparian areas and any of these undeveloped areas should remain undeveloped due to their rarity. Additionally, I suggest against further expansion of the Elwha and Sol Duc Campgrounds as I find the expansion unnecessary.				
60					
61	I welcome any expansion of wilderness or park boundaries. The only chance of returning these areas back to late-successional forests is through these designations. Many of the species dependent of older forests are hanging by a thread from extinction. Spotted owls populations continue to plummet 7.5 % annually and any additional assistance of habitat will assist this species in a recovery, hopefully. Olympic National Park should be the example and the cornerstone to the recovery of this species. Therefore, recreation should take second priority to biological considerations.				
62					
63	Please Adopt Alternative B as the preferred alternative. We can work recreation around the main objective of protection of the biological systems. People want to recreate in a place like Olympic Nation Park due to the intact ecosystems. Let us step up the protection of the ecosystems and the recovery of those species that need our help through this management plan. Thank you.				
64	190820			Grangeville	ID
65	As you write the Park's General Management Plan DEIS, I ask you to not let big business and corporations foolyou into thinking that a fully developed "amusement park" National Park is what the visitors want.				
66					
67	This is simply not true.				
68					
69	We want the maximum amount of area undeveloped where we may pursue the wonders of Olympic National Park in our own ways at our own pace ... usually alone or with only our family.				
70	My family and I enjoy the simple things in Olympic Park very, very much.				
71					
72	Please assure that your plan emphasizes and focuses on activities that do not detract from:				
73					
74	1) the feeling of solitude,				
75	2) the ability to smell the forest, and				
76	3) the ability to hear the faint sounds of wildlife, babbling brooks, and the wind in the branches.				
77					
78	Keep the noisy cycles and 4-wheelers out of the park unless they have a good muffler.				
79	190956		The Mountaineers	Seattle	WA
80	Dear National Park Service Administrator:				
81					
82	The Mountaineers, with over 10,700 members, is one of the premier outdoor recreation and conservation organizations in the Northwest. We actively pursue mountain-based recreation in the Northwest, and are equally fervent about the conservation of our natural resources. We therefore care deeply about the future of Olympic National Park (ONP) and wish to submit the following comments regarding the draft General Management Plan for ONP. Please consider our comments carefully as you revise the draft plan.				
83					

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
84	Our members have explored the Olympic peninsula since the club's founding in 1906, and we have been deeply involved in deliberations about management of ONP for many years. We worked to establish the National Monument that preceded the park's creation, and our interest, along with that of other conservation organizations, has focused on opposition to reducing the size of the park and to creating or maintaining roads that would despoil wilderness. We have also actively supported additions to the park that would further enhance wildlife habitat while increasing recreation opportunities in an ecologically responsible way. We also protested the proposed land deletions in the 1940's and 50's that would have allowed cutting in the Sol Duc and Quinault forests, and illegal "salvage logging" in the 1950's proposed under the guise of public safety. We opposed the removal of the private lands in the Lake Quinault area of the park that now provide valuable elk habitat, and supported the additions of the Queets, Ocean Strip, and Shi Shi areas to the park. We also protested the "ocean highway" proposals in the 1950's and 60's, and continue to encourage the removal of the non-native goats that have no natural enemies and seriously				
85					
86	We stress these past activities to emphasize the Mountaineers extensive interest in maintaining and enhancing the wilderness character of ONP and to establish the basis of our following specific comments, all of which focus on our sense of serious threats to the Park's wilderness character contained in the draft management plan. We must express our disappointment that a long overdue Wilderness Management Plan is not adequately addressed within this management plan. In fact, we find several instances where the Park's wilderness is jeopardized by recommendations within the preferred alternative.				
87	Without a comprehensive wilderness plan, the General Management Plan cannot be complete or true to the enabling legislation of the Park or the Federal Wilderness Act. We wish to remind you that the Park was established to protect the grandeur of the Olympic Mountains; portions of the ancient forests that reach from sea level to the mountain valleys; the rivers that flow from their glaciers and snowfields; and the great variety of wildlife whose home is this magnificent Park. ONP is a substantial portion of the Olympic Peninsula's ecosystem and an important Washington State natural resource for fish, wildlife, clean water, clean air, and responsible recreation. We believe that a management plan should be adopted that emphasizes, rather than jeopardizes, the essential wilderness character of the Park, and we therefore wish to make the following specific points based on this belief.				
88					
89	1) The preferred alternative does not guarantee sound wilderness management. It places far too much emphasis on the preservation and rehabilitation of dozens of structures built in the 30's & 40's that today are not needed by visitors or for the administration of the wilderness areas where these structures stand. Despite the management plan's contention that historic structures of all types "enhance wilderness character," this claim has been refuted in several successful federal lawsuits. The latest case was the attempt to place two "historic" shelters in the backcountry wilderness. According to the Historic Preservation Act, historic structures, especially those that can be found or replicated elsewhere, do not have to be maintained in place. Further, the introduction or maintenance of such structures violates provisions of the Wilderness Act.				
90					
91	2) The preferred alternative suggests that wilderness boundaries should be changed to permit relocating roads in river flood plains. Roads in flood plains are not only costly to maintain but also the frequent washouts and subsequent rebuilding of roads damage precisely the fish and wildlife habitat that the Park should be protecting. We thus definitely oppose changing wilderness boundaries for the sake of activities that violate the very wilderness that the Park is supposed to maintain! For example, as we learned from the washout on the Queets River, access to the Queets can be adequately obtained from Forest Service and Washington Department of Natural Resources roads. The first consideration for maintaining roads in floodplains should be resource preservation, not access. The Dosewallips River road is a further example of attempts to restore a road to the detriment of nature. Restoring the Dosewallips would remove huge old-growth trees, damage bird and fish habitat, and place the road on a hillside that would almost certainly wash out later while intruding on the wilderness character of the Buckhorn Wilderness.				
92	While the latest washout is on Forest Service land, and affects access to the Park's Dosewallips campground, we argue strongly that decisions such as these should emphasize maintaining wilderness and preserving wildlife habitat, not human access to trails or campgrounds. The National Park Service should be sensitive to these issues and support the best actions necessary to preserve the wildlife in and around the Park.				
93	The Mountaineers is against the reestablishment of road corridors, whether within the flood plain or in the forested uplands, that are negatively impact these resources and that requires Congressional authorization of altering wilderness boundaries. The ONP General Management Plan should adopt a roads network management policy that decommissions those roads, not rebuilding them.				
94					

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
95	3) Maintaining the Park according to the Wilderness Act of 1964 provides outstanding management guidelines for a park that has been essentially designated as wilderness under this Act. It reduces the need for maintenance of buildings and roads and the resulting costs. Precious resources can be best used for trail maintenance, scientific research, and visitor interpretation. Wilderness national parks should not replicate city parks, state parks, recreational areas, or amusement parks on a grander scale. They are places where humans visit and leave no trace. Facilities needed for human comfort that cannot be carried on one's back should be located outside a de-facto and de-jure wilderness park.				
96					
97	Attempts to zone wilderness have no factual basis in the Wilderness Act and should never be used in a wilderness plan or for management of any wilderness areas of the Park. Removal of vegetation around "historical" buildings in wilderness to protect the structure from fire only degrades the wilderness in order to preserve a structure within wilderness in the event of fire. As we state above, the main priority of ONP management should be maintaining the Park's essential wilderness qualities, not unnecessary and intrusive structures.				
98					
99	4) Large concentrations of developed campsites even near the Park's entrances would inevitably degrade the wilderness, diminish wildlife habitat, and stress the surrounding landscape. Large campgrounds, especially approaching 250 campsites, would increase tensions among visitors, increase the need for law enforcement, disrupt wildlife, and cause large areas of vegetation to be trampled. . Tourist concentrations should be provided in the communities surrounding the park, not within the Park's de-facto wilderness.				
100					
101	5) The Mountaineers support the Park's rivers being kept wild for fish and wildlife enhancement. We oppose rebuilding or repairing roads that damage the riparian areas. We strongly support the protective "river zones" as displayed in Alternative B. The rivers are vital as wildlife habitat, both for the fish within them and also for the other natural processes that depend on the river system. A natural Northwest forest depends on the salmon that return to spawn and a biological system that allows spawned carcasses to be left in the river to feed their offspring and other wildlife that, in turn, feed the surrounding plants and trees. Impediments to this process degrade the natural process of the whole riparian system. Regarding specific river systems, we prefer that ways be found to solve the stone accumulation problem at the bridge on Finley Creek other than the annual bulldozer removal. We agree with the proposal to designate the Elwha River as a Wild and Scenic River and believe that all the rivers within the Park should be included in the Wild and Scenic River System.				
102					
103	The club also agrees with the proposed addition of the Ozette Lake river system to the Park. This addition would protect fish and wildlife, and protect the Lake Ozette basin from pollution and siltation created by logging, road building, and other commercial activities. We wish to remind you that the Ozette Lake sockeye have been listed as a threatened species, and actions to secure this species' recovery are urgently needed.				
104					
105	We support adding needed elk habitat in the Lake Crescent area. We further support the recommend additions to the Queets River corridor and habitat additions in the Hoh and Quinault river systems.				
106					
107	However, the preferred alternative park expansions do not always conform to natural watershed boundaries. As a result, these expansions do not do enough to protect our valuable salmon and wildlife by preserving river habitat and preventing activities that pollute and silt fish spawning and feeding areas within the rivers. We do support the land additions as displayed in Alternative B. We further advocate that more resources be used to protect salmon and other fish species for the enrichment of the Park and the entire Olympic Peninsula ONP is a magnificent example of a natural ecosystem, and we therefore encourage the expansion of educational and interpretive programs to better educate the public about the interrelationships of land, plants, animals, and water in such a large and critical ecosystem.				
108					
109	6) We strongly urge that the Park's administration begin immediately restoring wolves in the park as they have done for the fisher. We also wish to emphasize that the Olympic Elk were specifically named as a reason for initially establishing ONP, and we are concerned that park roads are providing access for elk poachers. We therefore oppose adding roads that would facilitate poaching and ask for greater surveillance to stop this activity. We also wish to add that maintaining the elk herds would provide a natural prey for wolves, and thus minimizing poaching would contribute to a natural balance between wolves and elk within the Park.				
110					
111	7) To help preserve these natural systems we encourage the use of bus systems in heavily used and developed areas of the Park. Encouraging bus systems could reduce law enforcement problems and pouching, and limit damage to heavily used areas. We also support the development of short, all-accessible loop trails in the Park's front country. These trails could support the educational and interpretive programs that should be available to visitors, exposing them to the Park's many wonders.				
112					

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
113	Given these specific points, the Mountaineers believe that finalization of the General Management Plan should occur only after the development and subsequent public review of an extensive and well coordinated wilderness plan for ONP. Given the essential wilderness character of most of the Park, we believe strongly that the main goal of any new management plan for ONP must emphasize maintaining the wild character of one of the nation's most magnificent national parks.			
114				
115	In summary, the General Management Plan should:			
116	" Prioritize the preservation of ONP's natural systems, restoring threatened wildlife, and protecting the integrity of its world-class wilderness as the highest priority;			
117	" Expand park boundaries in five areas (Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, the Hoh, Queets and Quinault watersheds) to protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife as proposed in Alternative B;			
118	" Establish river protection zones to ensure that critical salmon habitats and natural river processes are preserved as proposed in Alternative B;			
119	" Recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic River designation;			
120	" Restore extirpated species like the wolf and fisher into the Park through a reintroduction program;			
121	" Keep developed areas at their current size as described in Alternative A. New recreational developments are best located outside the ONP;			
122	" Defer all related all decisions to wilderness until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed and available for public review;			
123	" Establish intertidal preserves on the Park's wilderness coast to protect biologically rich marine areas;			
124	The Mountaineers appreciates this opportunity to comment on the current draft management plan, and wishes to be kept informed of future development of this plan.			
125				
126	Sincerely,			
127				
128	William Deters, President			
129	187857		Ocean Shores	WA
130	After reading through the proposed General Management plan, I would request that the Park Service go with Alternative B. This preserves more of the natural beauty of the park, while still allowing visitor access.			
131	190825		Sequim	WA
132	I went to the presentation at Carrie Blake Park in Sequim, WA and spoke with the ONP rep about the Olympic Hotsprings plan.			
133				
134	I am very opposed to altering the hotsprings - this has been a favorite with our family, friends and relatives who come to visit us from all over. It is a unique feature that generates income for the Park because there is nothing like this anywhere nearby - a place of primitive beauty and warmth!			
135				
136	If you are worried about health effects of the springs, consider posting a permanent sign stating those hazards and let people decide for themselves.			
137				
138	I hike in the park and see no signs near streams telling me not to drink the water because I could get Giardia, and yet no one wants to close access to them.			
139				
140	We appreciate nature and everyone who comes with us makes sure to leave no garbage behind.			
141				
142	Thanks again,			
143				
144	190826		Sequim	WA
145	I have hiked to the Olympic hotsprings with my family and while I don't soak in them myself, I enjoy the beautiful surroundings and the sounds of my family having a good time together.			
146				
147	Please do not change the Olympic Hotsprings, other than possibly to put up a sign if you are worried about bacteria.			
148				
149	191189		Clallam	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
150	I would like the Ozette area to remain the same, do not add land to the east boundary and keep boating and all launches as they are, maintain them as needed. The park does need to improve the campground parking and follow up with the plan that was approved to provide more service to the Lake Ozette area. Do not restrict the uses, and the past practices of the inholders at all. The park continues to add fees to everything and we do not see or get any services at Lake Ozette, ONP. Also don't remove the man made pools that were made at Olympic Hot Springs, leave them alone for public use, that way they are nice the way they are. Thank you.		Bay	
151	188617		unknown	N/A
152	Please do not develop any more of this perfectly pristine environment. Visitor access is adequate; any more development will only compromise the integrity of the land and lower the quality of future visits.			
153	190819		Seattle	WA
154	To whom it may concern,			
155				
156	I write with regard to the forthcoming General Management Plan for			
157	Olympic National Park. I believe I can claim some expertise in this regard,			
158	since I conducted my Ph.D research in the park, on the behavior and ecology			
159	of Olympic marmots. Given the unique nature of this area, I would urge that			
160	it be maintained in a maximally pristine and wilderness condition, and that			
161	no holdings currently within the park be given or bartered away. Moreover,			
162	I very much hope that decisions regarding its wilderness status be deferred			
163	until a total management plan has been drawn up and is available for public			
164	assessment and comment. In addition, I would like to point out that my			
165	strong impression, accumulated over several years, is that there are serious			
166	impending wildlife problems in the park, which will require sensitive,			
167	ecologically-informed attention; I refer especially to the dramatic decline			
168	in marmot populations within the park, for which no cause has as yet been			
169	identified.			
170				
171	Thank you for your attention, and your care in managing one of America's			
172	last great wild areas.			
173				
174	Sincerely,			
175	191168		Boise	ID
176	Letter on file			
177	190726		Buckely	WA
178	I have rec'd a copy of the Draft GMP/EIS. I read some of it & skimmed all of it (there are a lot of words).I			
179				
180	Words I was looking for, did not find: Mountain goats, wolves, grizzly beards, snow mobiles, off-road vehicles, internal combustion engines, helicopters, horses, llamas, dogs, rats.			
181				
182	If they are addressed, please tell me where. If not, why not?			
183				
184	I am against all of them being in the wilderness area, with the possible exception of horses & llamas on a controlled basis. Controlled as to location and method of management.			
185				
186	It seems to me that, if this is a management plan, it ought to address the management of these things.			
187	190889		Forks	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
188	About the proposed plans for Olympic National Park - NO MORE LAND ACQUISITION. They (ONP) are unable, or unwilling to take proper care of what they already have acquired. Part of the problem is that funds coming in are designated for a single purpose, for instance, land acquisition (as in offshore oil leases in the Gulf of Mexico) With this type of designation, in theory, if it continued long enough, the Federal Government could own the whole country.			
189				
190	Trails and other accesses in Olympic National Park have been allowed to deteriorate. The Queets Road, closed by a slide, ahs not been reopened (one mand on a bulldozer could have accomplished this in one day - especially at this time of year with it's extra dry conditions).			
191				
192	Fortunately ONP does not own the right-of-way in the ocean strip (Ruby Beach - Kalaloch area) Hopefully the State cannot be forced to reroute Highway 101 there. Unfortunately this is not the case at Lake Crescent. ONP owns the right-of-way, so the State does not have that bargaining chip. Neither side of Lake Crescent is conducive to road building or improvement, nor would we want a high speed highway there. The answer lies in rerouting Highway 101 thourgh Bear Creek Pass, connecting with Highway 112 (at West Twin?), at least temporarily, until a new highway could be build closer to the hills north of Lake Crescent. (this would involve less, if any, private land) ONP should turn over East Lake Crescent Road to the State so that it can be widened, improved, and hooked into present Highway 101 at Lake Sutherland. Eventually Highway 101 should connect to the Highway 112 bridge southwest of Port Angeles.			
193				
194	Leave the Lyre River alone. Crescentii and Beardsely tourt are not the only species spawning there. Ownership by ONP is not going to make any improvements of the "fish friendliness" of the river. Plenty of regulations are already in place.			
195				
196	Stop trying to eliminate the mountain goats. They are historical and an interesting attraction, not a menace. They can easily be controlled by the proper placement of mineral blocks. As for the danger of causing extinction of rare native plants - nonsense! Pipers harebell, to name one species, usually grows in rock crevasses and cliff sides and plenty would be inaccessible to the goats. The Olympic Mountain Timothy (a grass) is an annual and reseeds easily.			
197				
198	The Hoh Visitor Center is untenable in its present location. It needs to be moved to the higher ground (bench) behind Taft Creek pond. The campground can stay. Another "Hall of Mosses" loop could be made - there are other areas available in that part of the Upper Hoh Valley. More improvements can be made to accommodate visitors who are not bound for the backcountry. This means that some areas will have to be cleared to accommodate sanitary facilities, parking and service areas, etc. This need not be done in an unsightly or disturbing way, but it must be done. The present facilities are taxed to their capacity and beyond. Above all, put more funds into maintenance in general, as well as infrastructure, road, and trail improvement.			
199	Stop trying to acquire the whole West Olympic Peninsula.			
200	190913		Forks	WA
201	I would like to comment on the proposed moving of Kalaloch Lodge and cabins. I am against it. Here are some of my reasons.			
202	First, the main attraction of the Lodge and Restaurant is it's location. The same for the cabins: Sunset Magazine recently listed this resort as number one for affordability and ambiance. The view at the mouth of Kalaloch Creek and the ocean beyond is unique and historic. Not only will the lodge be fifty years old in 2007, but it overlooks the site of the old clam cannery which operated on the spit of land just north of Kalaloch Creek (between the lodge and the ocean) during the 1920's.			
203	Secondly, the underlying geology; the immediate Kalaloch area from Brown's Point to the north to the southern boudary of the ONP "beach strip" is on flat, cedar swamp terrain. The base of this is clay, deposited during the last glaciation period about 20 thousand years ago. When Highway 101 was being built (late 20's) the constructors were forced to lay cedar puncheon in some aras to be able to have a semi-solid base for the road. They then covered it with beach gravel and went on from there. This clay is almost pottery grade, and is vegetated with trees and shrubs that are able to tolerate the lack of drainage. We get a lot of rainfall here, and if you dig down a little to find it, the clay is about the consistency of cream cheese.			
204	One of the reasons I know something about this clay underlayment is that a number of years ago, the park decided that the best way to restrict the number of vehicles at North Kalaloch campsites was to put short posts into the campsite areas. They sought out someone in this "local area" who had the right equipment to dig these postholes. We had a farm tractor, and our neighbor (my cousin) had a 12 inch auger post hole digger that fit our tractor. Sinc ethe men in the community were working at other jobs, I was elected (selected?) to do this job. ONP imported, from San Francisco, a man with a can of white spray paint to mark the exact post hole locations. I had a crew of two men behind me to align to drill and set the posts. One Saturday noon we managed to tap into the Main waterline behind the campground - by following the white dots. We dubbed these posts "fender benders", which they were, being jsut the right height to not be visible to "backer uppers." They were removed within a few years. I believe I dug around 1100 postholes. Most, except for a few inches of organic material overlay, were in pure clay.			
205	So leave the Kalaloch Lodge where it is, please, and protect it from the creek and the ocean with "sheet" piling of necessary. There is no better place for it to be.			
206	190721	Fineline Press	Clallam	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/Provin
2	Correspondence			
207	I support Plan D with an emphasis (I recommend) on preserving and restoring bird habitat in park/forest areas accessible to tourists. Thank You.		Bay	
208	190722	Fine Line Press	Clallam Bay	WA
209	Keep in mind, the West End resident population all have some creative talent, and are open to developing the arts to take advantage of the worlds biggest industry; arts, entertainment & media. This will support tourism and the healing of over-used resources, and provide local employment through the internet for worldwide companies. Develop tourism for a place to breath, not a tourist trap. Lighten the human footprint by wise, careful energy use a production (such as diesel-veg.oil conversion). The people here have visior and talent use it to save what we have for future generations.			
210	190729		Sandy	UT
211	Letter on File			
212	190803		Gaithersbur MD	
213	I am writting to request that you do not eliminate the soaking		g	
214	pools, as has been proposed, at Olympic Hot Springs. The problems			
215	that have been raised can be easily addressed without taking			
216	measures that would make the resource unusable by those seeking			
217	use of remote hot springs. I am opposed to all four of the current			
218	proposals. However, I am in agreement with the suggestions made by			
219	by the Naturist Action Committee. They are:			
220				
221	1) Reduce the number of pools to 3 from the current 4.			
222	2) Contract maintenance to a qualified caretaker.			
223	3) Convert Olympic Hot Springs Road to a trail beyond			
224	the Altair site.			
225				
226	Once again, I ask that you please do not eliminate the soaking pools			
227	at Olympic Hot Springs.			
228				
229	190526			
230	Dear Olympic Park Representatives,I was delighted to hear of your proposed expansion of Oly Park Boundaries.I want to talk about Lake Ozette because i'm so fascinated by the place.1. I'm 59 years old and an active sea kayaker. I often bring friends to Lake Ozette at least twice a year and have recommended it to many others. We only do primitive camping at the 7 or 8 informal primitive camping areas at Tivoli Island, Garden Island, Erickson Bay, and a few others depending on the weather and the amount of light left after the long drive to the lake.2. Its very unusual to have a natural lowland lake which is not surrounded by civilization and subject to motorized boating and wild partying. People who use kayaks, canoes or small sailing craft are often drawn to primitive areas to enjoy the natural beauty. And Ozette has plenty of that. At least 3 or 4 different kinds of water lilies grow in various places around the lake as do irises and other plants.			
231	Deer are plentiful, even on Tivoli Island, and we've seen a cougar footprint one time. 3. Some of my friends and relatives have traveled to the widely popular British Columbia Bowron Lakes Canoe area because of the length, size and primitive nature of the route. Well, Lake Ozette, in many ways has more to offer than Bowron Lakes because of its 8 to 10 mile length and varied shoreline. Not to mention the possibility to walk a two mile trail to the ocean beach for a spectacular side trip. This could be a major tourist draw to Olympic National Park, but a few things should be worked on to improve it.4. Number 1 Priority is i've often seen private land logged of its timber to within 10 to 20 feet of Ozette shoreline. Indeed, 2/3 to 3/4 of the lake is surrounded by a private lands except for a tiny slive of woods.			
232	Whenever you can, please purchase these private areas to shelter the lake's watershed and give the local wildlife a better green belt, if you will.5. Number 2 priority is to restrict motorboats to 10 hp or less. Having large motorboats roar around the lake really detracts from the primitive beauty of the lake, not to mention damage to the wild flowers and beach areas. Low horsepower would still allow handicapped folks to participate in the lake's environment, but would keep noise and wakes down. A HP exception could be made for Park or Research boats. I saw a NOAA boat in the lake about 2 years in a row, doing research on the seals that follow the salmon run into the lake from the outlet river.6. Number 3 priority is to eliminate acess to the boat ramp at Swan Bay except for authorized park or research boats.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
233	Lake campers like myself pay for access at the ranger station, why are others allowed a free ride into the lake. Its not right. It also doesn't allow the rangers to monitor what's going with regard to access.7. Although supposedly, motorboats are limited to the central area of the lake which accesses Erickson Bay, this rule is not enforced. A friend and I had spent 3 or 4 hours to paddle the length of the lake and pitch a tent on beautiful Tivoli Island. The next day, a large motorboat w/cabin and some 140 HP motor roared up to the island and landed with 3 inebriated passengers. I think they started to feel guilty because they walked around for awhile and then left. Motorboats are supposed to have access to that island. Let the motor and ski boats have Crescent Lake, Lake Cushman and all the other lowland lakes, please reserve at least ONE Washington State Lake for the kayakers, canoers, and small sail craft.I would mention that the grandfathered in pioneer cabins at the lake should be bought when they are available, but they are not really any kind of problem. They treat the lake with the same respect as the canoists and the kayakers.			
234	With the return of Indian Canoes and their annual summer trips around Puget Sound and Vancouver Island, perhaps Lake Ozette could also be an opportunity for them to have a celebration of Indian craft on the lake each year. Historically, the Indians used to follow salmon up the Ozette up the river from the Ocean to have a potlatch at Eagle Point.We have so few lakes with the history and beauty and location of Lake Ozette, please take action before the increasingly populated Oly peninsula makes it even more difficult to preserve this precious area.8. I could say a few words about Lake Crescent. I've biked the Spruce Trail on the North side of the Lake. It was a great trip although it was a bit of work as well, the good kind. I think its very important for Oly National Park to do what they can to facilitate the inclusion of the Discovery Trail from Port Townsend via Sequim, via Port Angeles, via Crescent Lake to Forks. The young people (and older people like myself) really need the outdoor adventure opportunities that such a trail could bring to our area. Please support it.			
235	9. I'm a member of Washington Water Trails organization, a really great organization. I think it would be neat for a coupla of primitive canoe/kayak campsites to be established around the lake to facilitate circumnavigation type trips. Wouldn't have to be a large numbers to see if they get used. Ones are especially needed at the Storm King area in the center area of the lake. The sites have to have some way of allowing the campers to pull their kayaks out of the water and tie they up somewhere. Of course a nearby restroom facility of some kind is useful in developed area.10. I guess thats about it. I appreciate the difficulty National Parks has in today's budget cutbacks. If i had my way, there wouldn't be any cutbacks for national parks.			
236	Oh yes, i'd like to say that the park ranger location at Lake Ozette is just fine and i've seen them report to worried relatives on the phone a few times as to whether visitor cars are still parked in the parking area or whether these hikers are now off the beach or lake. They do a lot of good work at that area. I don't think they or the residences should be moved.PS, also thanks for the great opportunity to provide feedback to this proposal and for the public meetings. (I showed up at the one in Bremerton at Ridgetop Junior High, 1 hour late to bring my brother who was getting off work, but the park representative already had left due to poor turnout. Oh well, catch you the next time.)			
237	190873		Ukiah	CA
238	Please do not remove the pools form the hot springs on Boulder Creek!			
239	Since the 1920's four generations of my family have loved the Olympic Hot Springs -- my grandparents in the 1930's, my mother as a little girl. My parents had their honeymoon there and later brought us kids up there every summer. That was when Schoefel had his resort there and we stayed in the cabins.			
240				
241	My husband and I went there when we got engaged, and though the resort was gone, the wonderful healing magic of the waters remained. For the last 20 years we have returned there practically every summer with our son.			
242				
243	It would break my heart if they were destroyed. It would probably break many hearts. Let's find a way to restore them. Please. Perhaps have fewer pools so the water would be more compact and flow more cleanly.			
244				
245	Thank you for taking the the time to listen.			
246				
247				
248	190848		Port Angeles	WA
249	Letter on File			
250	191171	Solduc Valley Packers	Port Angeles	WA
251	Letter on File			
252	190594	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington - Port Angeles	Port Angeles	WA
253	We request that all trails that are currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness that are open to horses should remain open to horses in the ONP General Management PPlan and not be zoned as either Primitive Wildernes Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone. All such trails should be classified in the Wilderness Trail Zone and remain accessible to stock use.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
254	190733		Sequim	WA
255	Letter on File			
256	190939	Green Crow Corporation	Port Angeles	WA
257	Comments on the May 2006 "Draft General Management Plan & Environmental Impact Statement" for the Olympic National Park.			
258				
259	By Harry Bell, Chief Forester			
260				
261	Green Crow Corporation			
262				
263	September 27, 2006			
264				
265	These comments focus only on the proposed boundary changes in the Lake Ozette and Lake Crescent areas and on the proposed 44,000-acre purchase and exchange lands in the Lake Ozette drainage. Regarding the development of facilities for the benefit of "front country" users we generally support alternative C without the road and faculty removals or the boundary expansion.			
266				
267	LAKE OZETTE BOUNDARY CHANGES (Alternatives B, C, and D)			
268				
269	Attached is a paper, written by Dr James Rochelle, providing scientific arguments showing that virtually all of the ecological benefits that are expected form ONP expansion are already being addressed by the State of Washington Forest Practices Laws and the Programmatic HCP including the Monitoring and Adaptive Management elements. Following are additional comments on ecological, economic and social issues.			
270				
271	Ecological Issues			
272				
273	Since 2001 I have been an active member of what is now the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan Steering Committee. Other committee representatives are from ONP, Indian Tribes, Clallam County, EPA, NOAA, private landowners and several State Agencies. Until 2006 our focus was on listing the factors limiting the recovery of sockeye and evaluating the supporting evidence that indicates that these factors have been or still are limiting. We are now developing the recovery plan. During this entire effort the ONP representatives have demonstrated an enormous disconnect with the existing ecological protection and management activities outside of the ONP boundaries. This disconnect is obvious throughout the Draft General Management Plan Document and is particularly demonstrated in the chapter entitled "Relationship of Other Planning Efforts To This General Management Plan." Neither the state HCP, the state forest practices laws nor the state forest practices rules are referenced in this chapter. As shown in the attached paper, an honest presentation of the benefits of these existing policies shows that virtually all of the ecological reasons for park boundary expansion (listed on page 370 of the proposed plan)			
274				
275	NOAA and the Recovery Plan Steering Committee are now developing the recovery plan for Sockeye, which will include recognition of the State HCP. For successful recovery of Sockeye, three additional things appear to be necessary within the current park boundaries'none of which are likely under the parks "wilderness" mandate. 1) Eliminate or significantly reduce predation by seals, river otters, cutthroat trout and pike minnows in the lake and the Ozette River, 2) Relocate enough large woody debris in the Ozette River to re-elevate the lake to its natural level, 3) Clean the lake gravels that have been silted in from tributary incising caused by the lower lake levels caused by removal of woody debris form the Ozette River. The ONP plan should allow these restoration projects to happen so that lake spawning sockeye populations can recover. Expanding the park boundaries will do nothing to fix these problems.			
276				
277	Since 1977, when the ONP last expanded its boundaries to include most of the lake shoreline, virtually nothing but finger pointing has been done to address sockeye recovery. This is an example of what might be expected under park management in the proposed expansion in the Lake Ozette Watershed. The ONP's recent catch and release policy for cutthroa trout'which are a demonstrated predator on Sockeye fry' is actually working against sockeye recovery.			
278				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
279	In contrast, private timberland owners have provided increasing protection measures for both fish habitat and water quality. In the Ozette drainage nearly 20% of the private land ownership is in stream or wetland protection zones restricted from timber harvest by state laws. We enhance biological diversity by providing a much broader spectrum of habitats for a much boarder spectrum of wildlife than the old growth and passive wilderness management typical of the ONP. Additionally, forest landowners are upgrading roads even though there is virtually no conclusive empirical data suggesting that these roads are having a measurable impact on water quality or sockeye recovery. These things will not happen under park service management.			
280				
281	Economic Issues			
282				
283	With two kids in public school my wife and I are acutely aware of the losing financial struggle of the school districts on the North Olympic Peninsula. Here in Port Angeles one school closed and at least one more will close. Other school districts to the west are having similar financial challenges. The primary reason is that enrolments are down because family wage jobs are on the decline. The Northwest Forest Plan devastated hundreds of families because unlike most other national forests the Olympic National Forest has no matrix lands under the plan. Ripple economic effects, including the closure of several saw mills and the Rayonier Pulp Mill, have caused the loss of many more family wage jobs. The recent influx of wealthy retirees and scattering of low wage tourism jobs have done little to offset this problem. People work and shop at Wal-Mart because they have no choice. We are still in economic decline and the ONP expansion will likely contribute to this downward trend. While ONP emphasizes that the boundary expansion does not change owner ship, the 1976 federal legislation that previously expanded the ONP clearly			
284	indicates that the intent was to buy from willing sellers and then to acquire the remainder by condemnation.			
285				
286	The sustainable and multiple use management of the private timberlands have, to some degree, mitigated these impacts by providing family wage jobs from timber harvest. Green Crow timber harvest in the Lake Ozette and Lake Crescent watersheds contributes several million dollars a year to the various foresters, loggers, truckers, road builders and tree planters.			
287				
288	Aside from the likelihood of another trust beneficiary lawsuit, a much bigger economic impact is likely if the proposed 44,000 acres of private land becomes state managed "Legacy Forests" especially if these lands are constrained by Forest Stewardship Council certification. Jobs will be lost. Schools and junior taxing districts will suffer.			
289				
290	Last, private timberland that falls within the park boundaries immediately loses value because of the Washington State Environmental Policy (SEPA) and state forest practices acts. Under these policies the ONP has a say on when, where and how private timber is managed. Even if the ONP is politically sensitive enough to not do this, the SEPA process gives any anti-timber or pro-park organization for example the Wilderness Watch, Olympic Park Associates, National Parks and Conservation Association or the Public Employees for Environmental Responsibilities, who are using the Wilderness Act to challenge the ONP's plans to protect cultural resources a very convenient and inexpensive appeals process that will gridlock any private forest timber harvest plans. Not only will we become a "willing" seller, but we will also be compelled to sell at significantly reduced prices. This is because the yellow book federal appraisal guidelines require valuation net of regulatory restrictions. In effect the ONP or pro-park organizations can influence the land and timber valuation.			
291				
292	Social Issues			
293				
294	On the private timberlands that ONP would like to "purchase" or lock up into "Legacy Forest" we practice sustainable consumptive use. That is, people catch fish and keep them and hunt for both recreation and subsistence. These important Tribal and local cultural activities will most certainly cease under ONP management. A current example is the ONP's catch and release policy for Cutthroat Trout in Lake Ozette and Lake Crescent. There is no data that indicates that these populations are even remotely at risk. Yet national park policy has stopped this valuable recreational and cultural activity.			
295				
296	Since the creation of the ONP there have been periodic episodes of park expansion. Each time more multiple use lands are lost to wilderness, more families are displaced and taxpayers are saddled with additional forever-increasing cost of park management. This trend raises the rhetorical question: Is the long-term goal of the National Park Service to minimize human occupancy, and control those left, on the Olympic Peninsula? The trend suggests an affirmative answer.			
297				
298	Conclusion			
299				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
300	There is a clear contrast between the National Park Service preservation philosophies'as exemplified by the Wilderness Act and the park's management activities'and the private land multiple use philosophy embodied in the Washington State Habitat Conservation Plan and private forest landowner's management activities. On the Olympic Peninsula we have an enormous land base committed to providing wilderness benefits. At the same time we are enormously lacking'and continually losing the land base necessary to fulfill our social, cultural and economic needs. Every acre of National Park expansion has a disproportionate negative impact on middle and working class families. On ecological, issues the benefits are small to nonexistent relative to current management. On the social and economic issues, the park expansion plans are clearly and grossly negative. For these reasons we oppose any boundary expansion of the ONP and the purchase and exchange of the proposed 44,000 acres.			
301				
302	190608		Philadelphi	PA
303	It has been several years since my family and I spent a wonderful		a	
304	vacation in Olympic National Park, but I remember it vividly. It is			
305	certainly a wonder worth preserving. We have one of your posters			
306	framed and mounted in our family room. We hope to return to Olympic			
307	National Park again soon.			
308				
309	Today, I am writing in support of the Naturists who are seeking to			
310	work with you in finding a constructive solution to the issues at			
311	Olympic Hot Springs that we all agree need to be addressed.			
312				
313	As I understand it, none of the four proposed alternatives covers all			
314	of our usage concerns at Olympic Hot Springs. For your consideration,			
315	the following three key amendments have been suggested to Park Service			
316	management by the Naturist Action Committee:			
317				
318	(A) Retain soaking at Olympic Hot Springs, but reduce			
319	the number of pools at the Springs site to three or four,			
320	located near the main source. This will improve cleanliness			
321	by offering less restriction to flow. It will help rehabilitate			
322	the runoff area, reduce the impact of use and enhance the			
323	integrity of the environment.			
324				
325	(B) Contract the maintenance of the resource to an			
326	experienced caretaker. This approach has been implemented			
327	with great success by other agencies responsible for			
328	managing hot spring resources in the Pacific Northwest.			
329				
330	(C) Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail			
331	beyond the Altair site. This is similar to an item proposed in			
332	Alternative B of the draft of the General Management Plan.			
333				
334	In regular tests of pools, nude use reduces contamination relative to			
335	equivalent pools where the participants wear bathing suits. It fact,			
336	it seems clothing optional use at traditional sites in the park is			
337	already known to be an environmentally friendly, low impact use of the			
338	resource. Further, naturists are responsible stewards of public lands.			
339				
340	Given the amendments above, we naturists feel that "rehabilitation" of			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/Provin
2	Correspondence			
341	Olympic Hot Springs would not require that this resource be made			
342	unusable for those seeking remote recreational experiences. We also			
343	feel that the other details of Alternative D of the NPS-preferred plan			
344	to accommodate traditional uses, and the traditional use at Olympic			
345	Hot Springs should be among those that are retained.			
346	190683			
347	Although I think my comments are more appropriate for the wilderness management plan, I would like to propose to the ONP the opening of the ONP packstock trails to packgoat use.	Evergreen Packgoat Club, North American Packgoat Association	Gig Harbor	WA
348				
349	Our organization includes people who have used horses and/or llamas for packstock. What people find with goats is that they are friendlier, they carry up to 30% of their body weight, and are very low impact on trails. In addition to recreational packing, goats have been used by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and State Wildlife and Fish Agencies where access is very difficult or where resource damage by traditional packstock is a concern. It is highly likely that the National Park Service policy will be listing goats as acceptable packstock, for backcountry use. The main point is that packgoats are very low impact animals compared to other packstock such as other stock like horses or mules that are already allowed in the park.			
350				
351	Goats used as packstock are predominately wethers (neutered males) and does. Bucks (intact males) do not pack, can not and will not pack. No one packs with bucks thus making it impossible to create any kind of feral population. Many of us have been packing with goats in the Olympic National Forest for years. If there was a problem with feral populations arising from the use of packgoats the ONP would have seen some sign by now. There is no such problem. Also, contrary to most beliefs, most goats don't stink- only bucks do, and since no one packs with bucks, there is no problems with goats drawing in predators, etc. Wethers and does actually have less of an odor than do horses or llamas. Thank you for your time and consideration.			
352	189382		Greenbank	WA
353	191008		Bellevue	WA
354	My first and foremost use of the Olympic National Park (ONP) is for whitewater kayaking. I've looked at all the maps for the rivers in the park that you are recommending, and to my layman's eye they look good. My primary concern is for river access at designated locations. I do NOT want this existing access points to be removed or barred.			
355				
356	The ONP offers an amazing whitewater experience and kayakers from all over the nation and world come to experience it. There are very few places left where someone can paddle through old growth forest and climate that are offered in the ONP.			
357				
358	And I often think to myself, when I'm on calmer sections in the ONP, that whitewater kayaking offers a view or experience of the park that cannot be achieved through any other means. In particular, I remember one trip on one of the Soleduc runs where it had just rained that day and the sun was streaming through old growth evergreen trees creating an amazing dancing rainbow. I specifically remember thinking that there was no other way to see this awesome sight that by whitewater kayaking. There are many others, but the point is that whitewater kayaking is not just fun for the people who do it in the ONP, it is also a way to experience that park in a way that not be done through any other means. Please make sure the plan specifically states that whitewater kayaking is an approved activity for all time.			
359				
360	I do have a couple of specific requests, although they may be applicable to the management plan. First off, the Queets Road that leads from HWY-101 to the Queets campground is horrible and way too unstable to maintain. I've feared for life more on that road than on class 5 rivers. I strongly suggest decommissioning the road and opening the access road between Queets road at Forest Service road 21. This benefits more than just kayakers. The Queets campground is amazing, but it not used very often because the Queets road is usually to treacherous for most sane people to go on. Secondly, you have a gem of a whitewater run in your park, but no one can get to it. I'm talking about the Upper Matheny, check out http://www.americanwhitewater.org/content/River/detail/id/2161/ for more details. There are multiple wash outs on the road. If it is at all possible to fix them, I would really like it to happen. I have a chronic injury, or handicap, that prevents me from walking long distances (which is why I got into whitewater kayaking), so I haven't been able to hike into this river. I REALLY want to run this amazing jewel in the ONP.			
361				
362	189387		Kirkland	WA
363	I am writing to urge the adoption of the National Parks			
364	Conservation Association's "Guarding park Resources and			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
365	wildlife, Transportation, Gateway Communities and recreation			
366	Opportunities for our Descendants" (Greater Good) alternative to			
367	Olympic's draft general management plan.			
368				
369	I understand that NPCA's "Greater Good" plan specifically			
370	details policies for the Olympic National Park that will			
371	protects visitor enjoyment, gateway communities and park			
372	wildlife and resources, maintenance and full staffing of visitor			
373	centers, as well as needed boundary adjustments.			
374				
375	I hope the National Park Service (NPS) will adopt NPCA's			
376	"Greater Good" alternative. Please let me know what action you			
377	plan to take.			
378				
379	188464	Forks Chamber of Commerce	Forks	WA
	Boundary adjustment is a clever euphemism for land acquisition. Whether by condemnation or sale, I am opposed to ONP acquiring any more land unless and until current lands			
380	can be maintained, serviced, and where appropriate, made available to more of the public. Backpackers and wilderness hikers are in the minority; thus most of the park is			
	inaccessible and I am opposed to this.			
381	190506		Fife	N/A
382	Lets's keep our land free from more pavemant and buildings. So much of our state is covered with buildings, and concrete.			
383	We need green spaces for animals to live.			
384	188243		None Provided	N/A
	Thank you for your planning of the future of our wonderful Olympic National Park. We have hiked and camped there many times and believe it to be one of the most beautiful places			
385	in the world. But I have come to understand that the current plan does not include repair and maintenance of the Norwegian Memorial Trail from Lake Ozette to the Norwegian			
386	Memorial. The trail to this historically significant place is an important component of the trail system of the park. We would appreciate seeing maintenance of it included in the plan.			
387	And has any thought been given to creation of a museum at Lake Ozette for display of artifacts from the lakes history?			
388				
389	Thank you for your consideration of our concerns			
390	190841		Port Angeles	WA
391	I am writing in opposition to Alternative B and Alternative D of the Olympic National Park GMP. Expansion of the park would have many detrimental effects.			
392	1. Maintenance and operation budget would need to be spread over a larger area. Trails			
393	would be neglected, and safety issues would become an issue. Visitors traveling off			
394	the trails would cause more harm to vegetation, and have more negative experiences			
395	with animals. Personnel would not be able to meet the needs of the public.			
396	2. Economy of the area would adversely impacted. The proposed expansion would			
397	include private, federal and state land which now provides family wage jobs in			
398	logging, sawmills, trucking, paper, and related industries. These industries and			
399	private land also provide a tax base to support our area schools, hospital, and other			
400	services.			
401	3. Decreased logging would drive the elk further out of their homes, as they need open			
402	areas for grazing.			
403	4. Conclusions related to fish and wildlife, and to vegetation are vague and based on			
404	theories such as global warming which are disputed by many respected scientists.			
405	191253		Clallam	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
406	Letter on File		Bay	
407	190076		Vancouver	WA
408	Option A would be fine, and if enough money for it, Option D would be ok too			
409	191196		Yelm	WA
410	I am writing to comment on the Olympic National Park Wilderness Plan.			
411				
412	As a horseperson and a member of Back Country Horsemen, I do not want to lose access to trails beyond what we have already lost.			
413				
414	Please keep the trails open to horsemen. We need horse trails for our children and grandchildren to ride on.			
415				
416	I strongly support HR 586- Right to Ride Livestock on Federal Lands Act of 2005.			
417	188675		Kent	WA
418	Olympic National Park is probably the wildest, most natural, least developed piece of land left in this country. It would be a shame to further develop it. I support Alternative A or B. This land is best left as undisturbed as possible while still allowing wilderness experience for those prepared to deal with wilderness. The facilities that are available are adequate for the visitors who go there. I would support public or private development outside the park which would support the park, however. For example, interpretive centers near entrances, small hotel/motels and restaurants, campgrounds, etc. Let's follow Canada's example in leaving wilderness as wilderness, and catering to the wildlife while allowing people to use the park with as little impact as possible. Please leave this lovely park alone.			
419	190897		Tacoma	WA
420	We (myself and Michelle) don't want to lose our right to ride anywhere. Keep what we have open. We ride and we vote.			
421	190993		None Provided	N/A
422	Concerns Related to DRAFT GMP			
423				
424	"The increased number of interpretive and educational media, programs, and			
425	new or			
426	expanded facilities would accommodate projected increases in park			
427	visitation,			
428	address all of the primary interpretive themes, assist with trip-planning			
429	opportunities, provide an integrated approach to cultural and natural			
430	resources			
431	and processes, and connect park resources to the broader expanse of the			
432	Olympic			
433	Peninsula. This would have a long-term, moderate to major beneficial impact			
434	on the			
435	visitor experience in the park and throughout the region." Pp 305			
436				
437	This statement is echoed in the preferred alternative, and in many ways can			
438	be seen to compliment NPS goals.			
439				
440	Pp 99			
441	Soundscapes			
442	NPS Policy §4.9			
443	NPS Management Policies (§4.9) require the			
444	National Park Service to preserve the natural			
445	soundscapes of the park. Natural soundscapes			
446	exist in the absence of human-caused sound.			
447				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
448	Pp 312			
449				
450	Concern raised is about the unintended/unplanned/unregulated noise impact(s)			
451	of intensified Front Country development.			
452				
453	It has been my experience that car headlights along roads and aerial			
454	overflights by non-NPS aircraft probably create the most disruptive			
455	intrusions on backcountry experience. I am far less concerned about the			
456	sonic impacts of front country development, unless the NPS were to succumb			
457	to manufacturers' pressure and allow dirtbikes, ORVs, or other deliberately			
458	noisy motorized vehicles, as the USFS has occasionally considered. The most			
459	serious concern I would raise is that equipping front country areas for the			
460	increased utilization by self contained RV's will almost certainly increase			
461	the number of people sitting clueless in their cages, generators running,			
462	watching television and video, insensitive to the unintended harm they are			
463	doing, substantially decreasing the quality of the available front country			
464	experience for traditional tent campers.			
465				
466				
467	Pp 328			
468	Visitor Use/Visitation/Road Access			
469				
470	Better demographic and visitation information than is provided in this plan			
471	is available from the USFS R-6 geospatial planner. From this reviewer's POV,			
472	it is essential to provide plan elements that are likely to sustain or			
473	increase park visitation and utilization over the next 10 - 15 years, and			
474	that these plan elements reflect the most probable scenarios for both			
475	changing economic environment nationwide and changing demographics in the			
476	region surrounding ONP. Stating that "visitation is expected to continue to			
477	increase in proportion to regional population" seems naïve and unlikely to			
478	prove true over the GMP's planning horizon.			
479				
480				
481	Pp 329			
482	Impacts on Visitor Opportunities			
483				
484	In spite of the emphasis on health and fitness, and continued improvements			
485	in technology (fabrics, lighter boots, hiking poles) increased "spikiness"			
486	in the utilization of the Spectrum of Park Environments can be expected to			
487	accelerate as major components of the Park's traditional visitor base lose			
488	their ability to access the backcountry areas they visited in the '80's and			
489	'90's unless they are provided with assistance from porters, guides, or			
490	pack animals. The number of mobility challenged park users will increase			
491	steadily, and more front country trails will need to be upgraded to meet			
492	accessibility standards if these visitors are to be retained. This general			
493	shift is likely to continue throughout the life of the GMP and the defining			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
494	more precisely the range of options that could become available to retain			
495	these potentially lost visitors as active park users and supporters is a			
496	problem that should be addressed more directly in the preferred alternative.			
497				
498				
499	In the near-term, the greatest shift in visitation may well take the form of			
500	decreased backcountry utilization and increased road-based recreation,			
501	including substantially increased motorhome traffic. This trend would			
502	support intensified front country development to accommodate overnight			
503	visitation by the retiring baby-boomers in their oversized motorhomes, but			
504	Chapter 3's discussion of Alternative Transportation (pp 161 162) address			
505	only the present condition "transit plays a limited role in providing			
506	access to the Park"- which fails to address the future needs of the park.			
507				
508	Development strategies in the Preferred Alternative ought to address park			
509	visitation and access options that extend farther into the future - into			
510	what is likely to be seen as the age of ever increasing fuel costs - and			
511	directly address the option of scheduled transportation carrying an ever			
512	increasing share of the access. This would directly and beneficially affect			
513	the safety of bicyclists on paved roads in and around the Park and the			
514	resident front country animals.			
515				
516	190953	State Historic Preservation Officer	Olympia	WA
	On behalf of the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), I want to take this opportunity to follow-up on our letter of August 28, 2006			
517	regarding the Draft Olympic National Park (ONP) General Management Plan & Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). As stated in our August letter, we concur that			
518	Alternative D, the preferred alternative, will have "no adverse effect" on significant cultural resources within the park. Our concurrence is based upon the stated "focus on balancing			
	the protection of natural and cultural resources with improving the visitor experience."			
519	As the ONP implements plans and policies in the GMP, DAHP looks forward to consultation from the National Park Service (NPS) when implementation of a project has potential to			
520	affect cultural resources listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places. As you know, this consultation is mandated of all federal agencies as a result of			
	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its implementing regulations as found in 36 CFR Part 800.			
521	We are aware there is concern and confusion as the relationship of the Wilderness Act of 1964 and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended). We wish to note			
522	the following.			
523	Section 110 (2) of the National Historic Preservation Act states that:			
524				
525	Each federal agency shall establish (unless exempted pursuant to Section 214) of this Act, in consultation with the Secretary, a preservation program for the identification,			
526	evaluation, and nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, and protection of historic properties.			
527	Further the Act requires that:			
528				
529	..such properties under the jurisdiction or control of the agency as are listed or may be eligible for the National Register are managed and maintained in a way that considers the			
530	preservation of their historic, archaeological, architectural and cultural values in compliance with Section 106 of this Act&.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
531	As you will note, there is no exemption in this Act that allows Wilderness Areas to take precedence over the preservation of historic properties. Certainly this is evident in Section 4(3) which states:			
532				
533	Nothing in this Act shall modify the statutory authority under which units of the national park system are created. Further the designation of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system as a wilderness area pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such park, monument, or other unit of the national park system in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916&.			
534				
535	We also note that some parties have referenced Wilderness Watch v. Mainella, 375 F.3d 1085 (11th Cir. 2004), as supporting Wilderness Areas over historic preservation. Wilderness Watch did not address the general relationship between the Wilderness Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, and it did not conclude that one Act superseded the other. The issue was whether the National Park Service's use of a fifteen-passenger van to transport visitors through a Wilderness Area to a historic site was "necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration" of the historic area under the Wilderness Act. The court concluded the Wilderness Act unambiguously prohibited the Park Service from offering motorized transportation to park visitors through a Wilderness Area. Because the issue involved motorized vehicles rather than historic preservation, the court had no occasion to apply the National Historic Preservation Act. Interestingly, however, the court did note that			
536	Congress may separately provide for the preservation of an existing historic structure within a wilderness area, as it has done through the NHPA.			
537				
538	The decision in Olympic Park Associates v. Mainella, 2005 WL 1871114 (W.D. Wash. 2005), is another in which the court was not faced with a conflict between the Wilderness Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. This office determined that two historic shelters in a Wilderness Area were eligible for listing under the NHPA, notwithstanding the fact they had collapsed in a snowstorm three years earlier. The Park Service proposed to replace them with new shelters constructed elsewhere and flown in. The eligibility for listing was determined based on the perspective of the shelters' original construction and historical use, but held that perspective changed once the Olympic Wilderness was designated. The court held the replacement of the collapsed shelters with new structures violated the Wilderness Act, and it found nothing in the NHPA that authorized the new structures:			
539				
540	[T]he NHPA's goal of preserving historic structures allows for "rehabilitation, restoration, stabilization, maintenance," (16 U.S.C. § 470w(8)), among other things, but it does not require reconstruction. Thus, where the former shelters have been destroyed by natural forces, NHPA does not require reconstruction.			
541				
542	The court did reference the procedural character of the NHPA, noting that it does not forbid the destruction of historic sites nor by command their preservation, but simply orders the government to take into account the effect any federal undertaking might have on them.			
543				
544	It may be significant that the court characterized the Wilderness Act as the specific provision governing the issue, and the National Historic Preservation Act as the general provision. The general rule applied by the courts is that specific provisions prevail over conflicting general provisions, which likely signals that any conflict between the NHPA and the Wilderness Act would be resolved in favor of the Wilderness Act in any case brought in the federal courts in the Western District of Washington.			
545				
546	I note with concern that a recent decision from California, which relies on both of the cases mentioned above, appears to hold that the Wilderness Act supersedes the NHPA. In High Sierra Hikers Ass'n v. U.S. Forest Service, 436 F. Supp. 2d 1117 (E.D. Calif. 2006), the Forest Service sought to repair or rebuild a number of "dam structures" located in a designated Wilderness Area. Several of the structures qualified as historic properties under the NHPA and were eligible for listing on the National Register. The court held that the proposed actions were "clearly and unambiguously contrary to" the provision in the Wilderness Act that prohibits "structures or installations" in Wilderness Areas. After reviewing the decisions in both Wilderness Watch and Olympic Park Associates, the court concluded:			
547				
548	Absent a declaration by Congress of the need to restore and preserve the dam structures in recognition of their historic significance, there is nothing the court can point to that would authorize such an action where the maintenance of the dams would otherwise come into conflict with the Wilderness Act.			
549				
550	& Here, as in Olympic Park, the object of the activity is to perpetuate the existence of structures in a wilderness area.&			
551				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
552	Here, there is no logical necessity in maintaining, repairing, or operating the dams in order to administer the area for purposes of the Wilderness Act. The area manifested its wilderness characteristics before the dams were in place and would lose nothing in the way of wilderness values were the dams not present. What would be lost is some enhancement of a particular use of the area (fishing), but that use, while perhaps popular, is not an integral part of the wilderness nature of that area.				
553					
554	& The Wilderness Act's prohibition against structures is categorical so far as the court can determine, allowing only those exceptions that are specifically set forth in the Act or in Congress' designation of a particular wilderness area, neither of which apply here.				
555					
556	As you know, the Wilderness Act itself includes a partial exception for units of the National Park System, 16 U.S.C. § 1133(a)(3), under which laws pertaining to historic preservation, including the NHPA, continue to apply in Wilderness Areas so long as they are administered to preserve the area's wilderness character. In our view, this fact distinguishes your proposal from all three of the court decisions references above, because none of those decisions addressed the effect of § 1133(a)(3). Your Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement is thoroughly cognizant of the tension between historic and archaeological preservation laws and the Wilderness Act and, in our view, addresses that tension in a way the complies with the Wilderness Act while providing important protection for cultural and archaeological resources in the Park.				
557					
558	Finally, the concept of a Wilderness as a place without people completely ignores the profound significance of Native American history and culture. We know from Native American testimony, archaeological evidence, and historic documents that people have lived, used and altered the landscapes of all of Washington for the last 12,000 years.				
559					
560	Therefore, based on the length of time of human occupation of Olympic National Park, and relevant case law, we contend that Alternative D is the most productive alternative for meeting the goals of Congress under all relevant legislation.				
561					
562	Sincerely,				
563					
564					
565					
566					
567	Allyson Brooks, Ph.D				
568	State Historic Preservation Officer				
569	190936				
570	The following are my personal comments regarding the GMP for Olympic National Park.			None Provided	N/A
	The most important part of the whole document for me was only stated at the very beginning, and tends to be lost in the changes that are made in and around the Park. That would be the enabling legislation of Olympic National Park itself, particularly as stated; "set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." Over the years I have watched as trails are abandoned, campsites eliminated, and roads have become unmanaged. How do these actions benefit the enjoyment of the public as visitation continues to increase? Most visitors do not expect the Park to create more roads, add more trails or campsites. However, the slow removal of infrastructure is not to the benefit of the American public. Parks will continue to be appreciated and protected as long as people are allowed to use and enjoy them. The Olympic National Park needs a clean balance of both preservation and use!				
571					
572					
573	Historic Structures				
574	I hope that the Park will put more energy into preserving some of the last remaining homesteads in the Park. Many are getting degraded and need to be restored, due to the lack of attention over the decades. Flying restrictions as well as a short summer season complicate repairs to most structures.				
575					
576	Access				
577					

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
578	I believe every effort should be made to keep all existing roads open and maintained for public access. With The Olympic National Park having no roads through it, and very few roads that penetrate into its interior, it is vital that the existing road infrastructure be maintained for visitor access. The Hurricane Ridge road alone should have year-round access, including every effort to keep it open during the winter months, as this is the only drivable access point to the alpine country in winter. The Sol Duc road should also remain open year round this should also include the winter season as it was designed during its reconstruction in the late 80's.			
579				
580	Kalaloch			
581				
582	Kalaloch is one of the only places where visitors can stay the night in rustic cabins dine at a great restaurant and enjoy the sun setting on the Pacific Coast and still remain in The Olympic National Park. To remove all infrastructures from the beach would ruin the entire experience that it now offers. Any removal of the cabins from the bluff area, including the Lodge itself, should be done on a case by case basis only.			
583				
584	Wilderness			
585				
586	Ever since Olympic was designated an astounding 95% wilderness, it has become harder and harder for simple repairs and maintenance to take place. Environmental Impact Studies that take years for simple repairs to roads, bridges, trail washouts, and even campground maintenance are costing precious time and money. In reading the description of what is Wilderness, it is clear that there were many areas included that clearly do not fit, as they have man-made infrastructure in them. Unfortunately, in the past these delays have lead to deaths in the park due to missing bridges requiring dangerous stream crossings.			
587				
588	Conclusion			
589				
590	In conclusion, The Olympic National Park is a true gem to be protected as well as enjoyed by those who choose to visit and enjoy her. She is unlike any other of her sister Parks and has the diversity of her grand mountain peaks reaching out to the coastline of the Pacific Ocean. For as far back as history tells us, man has ventured through her vast mountains in awe of their grand beauty, just as is the case today as hikers and backpackers alike venture into the untamed wilderness to catch a small glimpse of what it was like for those first pioneers who explored the great Olympic Backcountry.			
591				
592	190707		Seki	WA
593	I am opposed to any restrictions of motor boats on Ozette Lake			
594	I would like to see a road from the Hoko Road to Forks.			
595	190937			
596	We have recently become aware of the Park Service's proposal to update its General Management Plan. We appreciate public processes, and know first hand about the need to balance multiple values and viewpoints. We also appreciate locally developed plans for managing natural resource issues, and feel that agreements developed by collaboration with interested stakeholders are the best way to develop lasting solutions. We understand that the park has hosted several open houses and is now accepting public comment on its Management Plan. The purpose for our writing is to make the Park aware that preferred alternative "D" includes annexation of private forestland, and removal of a substantial amount of commercial timberland from the economic base, in order to protect public resources, without acknowledging the plans that Washington has already put into place to address these issues.	Representative 24th Legislative District	None Provided	N/A
597	One of the things that we as Legislators are most proud of is our 1999 sponsorship, of ESHB 2091, the Forests & Fish Law. The bill, which was supported by a 2/3rds bi-partisan majority of the state Legislature, addressed protection of clean water, salmon and aquatic habitat, and resulted in a 50-year Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), encompassing 9.3 million acres of private and state forestland. The Forests & Fish Law resulted from a science-based forest management plan developed by more than 140 individuals, including 34 federal, state, county, tribal and industry scientists who worked together for 18 months.			
598	After a decade, the federal government approved the HCP acknowledging that forestry practices in Washington State are protective of salmon and aquatic habitat. The Park needs to be aware that we have addressed the protection of public resource concerns here at the state level.			
599	Washington's forestlands now have among the highest level of environmental protection in the United States. The forest products industry is the only sector in Washington that has a salmon recovery plan for protecting fish habitat and water quality, backed up by law. We also have some of the best tree growing country in the world, with our combination of rich soils and wet environment, making the practice of forestry Washington State plain common sense.			
600	It is important that we understand that Washington State has become a leader in its ability to develop local solutions that balance environmental protection and maintain a healthy forest industry.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
601	With this step forward in resource protection, Washington State becomes the leader not only for environmental protection, but also for its ability to find solutions that balance the protection of our precious natural resources while producing the forestry products that we all use every day.			
602	Removing another 60,000 acres of commercial forestland from the Peninsula will affect local communities by removing about a year's worth of sustainable harvest volume from the timber basket, in an area that has already suffered economic hardship through the disruption of federal forest policies of the early.			
603	We encourage the Park to remove the boundary expansion proposal in its preferred alternative "D" and acknowledge the accomplishments made for resource protection here at the local level.			
604	Sincerely,			
605				
606	Representative Jim Buck			
607	190649		Gig Harbor	WA
608	Dear Sirs:			
609				
610	I would like to comment on the proposed Olympic National Park General Management Plan. I understand that Alternative D is currently the preferred plan. It's also my understanding that all 4 alternatives are consistent with the overall intent and purposes of the park, the purposes of a general management plan and enabling legislation. I encourage the park to consider alternative C which I understand would allow increased recreational opportunities and wilderness access. The purpose of a National Park is for people to visit and enjoy while at the same time preserving the natural resources for future generations. This is necessarily a balancing act. In my experience the current management of the park tends to discourage people from visiting the park (likely unintentionally).			
611				
612	I ask that the general management plan consider the National Park System 2006 Management Policies which were adopted August 31, 2006.			
613				
614	Section 8.2 states:			
615	"8.2 Visitor Use			
616	Enjoyment of park resources and values by the people of the United States is part of the			
617	fundamental purpose of all parks. The Service is committed to providing appropriate, high-quality opportunities for visitors to enjoy the parks, and the Service will maintain within the parks an atmosphere that is open, inviting, and accessible to every segment of American society."			
618				
619	"8.2.2.8 Recreational Pack and Saddle Stock Use			
620	Equine species such as horses, mules, donkeys and burros, and other types of animals (including llamas, alpacas, goats, oxen, dogs and reindeer) may be employed when it is an appropriate use to support backcountry transport of people and materials and will not result in unacceptable impacts."			
621				
622	The Olympic National Park General Management plan divides the park into Management Zones. Under all zones "Stock use" lumps all stock together. Horses and mules are what are commonly thought of when "Stock use" is considered. However, other pack stock such as llamas, alpacas and pack goats have significantly less impact than horses. I would ask that the plan allow for the fact that there may be places where it would be perfectly acceptable to allow llamas or pack goats even when horse use may not be acceptable.			
623				
624	I think this is an important point. Many people are precluded from accessing the backcountry / wilderness except for short day hikes because they can not carry the weight of a backpack with the supplies needed for a safe overnight trip. This includes families with small children and older people who have physical difficulties. Particularly as the 'baby boomer' generation ages the number of people with back, hip or knee problems will grow significantly. Allowing llamas or pack goats where appropriate would provide opportunities for these people to access the backcountry / wilderness.			
625				
626	Thank you for considering my input.			
627				
628	190921		Mazama	WA
629	Please count me as favoring your preferred alternative "D". I'm a retired NPS ranger-naturalist-trail crew, with 4 winters as the snow ranger under Jack Hughes on Hurricane Ridge, 4 years as a sub-district ranger (Hurricane and Staircase), 3 summers as a seasonal naturalist at the Ridge, one summer cleaning up the C-141 on Inner Constance, and one summer on the trail crew.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
630	I particularly like the extension of the "Development Zone" at Hurricane, down around "the slot" to include the Sunrise snow play area. Future shuttle bus use will require a warming hut or two there, including sanitary facilities. This area is out of the worst winds during storms and therefore essential for visitor safety and enjoyment. This will be especially true when Yellowstone style oversnow shuttle service is finally installed.			
631				
632				
633	The ski facility wording is sufficient to allow upgrading the current Poma lift to a chair lift, which would let the vegetation under the cable be restored. This could also run in summer allowing wider distribution of semi-ambulatory visitors on nature trails winding down gently through Idaho Bowl, north of the picnic area.			
634				
635	Deer Park may see enough ski touring in the future to require a ski hut. This would still be "low use" but could serve as an upgraded restroom for summer traffic too. A large ski hut at Waterhole and warming huts serving skiers, hikers, and sightseers, at shuttle bus transfer points along Hurricane ridge Road are the principle "ski facilities" I foresee a need for, to encourage the type of use most appropriate to teh Park. These would of course serve the public year round, so they're not strictly just ski facilities. The removable surface lifts are the only exclusively "skiing facilities" , I see a need for.			
636				
637	"Alternative transport" is especially appropriate to Hurricane Ridge, and absolutely necessary if we are to ever cut back on teh carscape esthetic intrusion. It will however require alternative forms of shelter, outlined above, to repalce the shelter currently provided by automobiles and RVs.			
638				
639	These ideas are more fully fleshed out, to sell them to the public, in a book I'm finishing up this fall: Ski Trails and Wildlife - Toward Snow Country Restoration. Hurricane Ridge is the National Park example I chose to illustrate the principles needed for restoring wildlife in ski country.			
640				
641	Note on page two of comments (map): When oversnow shuttle buses, Yellowstone style, are installed - grooming will be needed down to wherever the transfer point is to rubber tired buses. This both smooths out the washboard for better comfort and lower maintenance on the oversnow buses, and makes the road skiable to decrease the afternoon passenger load.			
642				
643	Shuttlebuses here would eliminate marmots checking rubber on parked cars. The waterhole "Ski" hut would serve as the bustop shelter.			
644	190842		Sequim	WA
645	I am very hopeful that the Park will take into consideration the			
646	recommendations proposed by the Olympic Park Associates.			
647				
648	I think that it is time that we take the protection of the Olympic			
649	Peninsula's rivers a step farther and have the 13 rivers (proposed by			
650	Olympic Park Association) included into the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers			
651	designation. Many of these rivers represent vital salmon habitat and very			
652	unique biological diversity to the region.			
653				
654	I also urge the park to limit in-park commercial development and to develop			
655	the campground and RV parks outside ONP.			
656				
657	I appreciate you taking the time to listen to citizens who are concerned			
658	about the future of the park. Please protect our natural heritage...it's			
659	the only ONP that we have.			
660				
661	191257		Seattle	WA
662	Please act to EXPAND park boundaries and preserve/expand wilderness. Please do not allow development and roads that harm the wilderness.			
663				
664	Hurricane Ridge Center already lets people see this view. We don't need more roads [postcard view referenced].			
665	190796		Port	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
666	Letter on File		Angeles	
667	190899		Port Angeles	WA
668	Letter on File			
669	188605		Poulsbo	WA
670	Preservation is the only sane option, anything less would be a crime. What I fear most is that someday they will attempt to bring earth moving equipment in to build projects of mass size. I don't ever want to see the Olympics inundated by bus tours like many other NPs! I believe what is necessary is preservation over development, with a focus on maintenance of what is already in place.			
671	191175	Port Angeles Business Association	Port Angeles	WA
672	Letter on File		Forks	WA
673	191254			
674	Letter on File			
675	190508		None Provided	N/A
676	Please protect and increase our wonderful Park, by adding wider buffers of the unique ecosystems such as Lake Ozette and Lake Crescent.			
677				
678				
679	Keep ONP natural.			
680	190990		Port Angeles	WA
681	I would like to comment on the long-awaited draft General Management Plan (GMP) for Olympic National Park (ONP), specifically in regard to floodplain management.			
682				
683	Part A, Support for Alternative B for Floodplain Management			
684				
685	I'll first make the general point that protection of the natural resources of the Park must be paramount, and that all other goals must be subsidiary. I'll then apply that concept to the area of floodplain management in the Park, concluding that both enlightened management and federal law necessitate more careful floodplain management than is outlined in the Park's Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative). A more-flexible version of Alternative B would be a more enlightened and lawful approach.			
686				
687	1. Protection of natural resources should be paramount.			
688				
689	A conservation-first policy is, first of all, required by the Organic Act that created the National Park System in 1916 in order to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Enjoyment is to be maximized as well, but that enjoyment clearly has to be contained within the context of resource protection.			
690				
691	The Secretary of the Interior and Park Service Director recently underscored this conservation-first policy. As the Director stated, "We want to make sure that enjoyment in not going to impair our resources and & if there's a conflict, conservation will be predominant" (AP 9/1/06).			
692				
693	Beyond what the law says, conservation-first is the best long-range policy quite on its own merits. If we believe in the rule of law in American society, then the people own these parks in perpetuity and must manage them as such. If we allow degradation of resources, no matter how slight, and then project that degradation over time, we will ultimately witness a massive breakdown of the Park's natural systems, because forever is a very long time. Such impairment is all the more imminent in a world burdened by population growth, continual land development, and social disruption.			
694				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
695	Obviously there are certain forces beyond the control of Park officials, such as ocean harvest of anadromous fish, transcontinental air pollution, and global climate change. However, the fact that management goals might be undercut by outside forces in no way excuses Park managers from seeking those goals; indeed, such threats from outside are grounds for action by Park and other federal officials on a wider scale, both national and international. As the world's ecosystems break down, natural preserves serve as biota reserves that dampen the wave of extinctions and help to keep nature's genetic legacy intact. Furthermore, these otherwise-pristine preserves serve as a standard measure of the impacts of global environmental threats, as the Park Service acknowledges with its Long-Term Ecological Monitoring (LTEM) program.			
696				
697	I'll illustrate this point with an example. A neighbor expressed a liking for the mountain goats which were introduced into the Park in the early part of the last century, and which have been colonizing the Park ever since. "So what if they eat some rare mountaintop plants? Frankly, I'm going to get a lot more enjoyment from those mountain goals than I am from some little plant." My neighbor's point is well taken, but human enjoyment is not the primary purpose of the National Parks. If it were, then decisions about how to run the Parks would be determined by human pleasure rather than natural systems, and in that case we may as well sell the Parks to the Disney Corporation.			
698				
699	2. Primary protection should go to natural resources most threatened with significant and long-term or irretrievable loss.			
700				
701	If conservation of natural resources is paramount, then particular attention must be paid to the greatest hazards and vulnerabilities affecting those resources, unless they are beyond saving. Anything less would be tantamount to accepting eventual degradation of the resource.			
702				
703	3. Cumulative impacts must be carefully heeded.			
704				
705	If we're managing the Parks in perpetuity, then it's important that our management actions not lead to gradual deterioration over time. The GMP may only cover a span of 20 years, but Management will theoretically continue forever, and our 20-year plan mustn't leave a diminished legacy for the next 20-year plan. Therefore, the Plan must attend not only to acute impacts, but also more subtle cumulative ones. The National Environmental Policy Act makes clear the importance of honestly assessing cumulative impacts.			
706				
707	4. Infrastructure in floodplains has particularly severe long-term cumulative impacts.			
708				
709	Development in floodplains is problematic because alluvial streams have an inherent tendency to shift within their floodplains. Therefore, any resource constructed in a floodplain stands a good chance of becoming threatened or destroyed at some point by its neighboring river. When such threats occur, the natural human response is to protect the infrastructure. In ONP, the threat is usually to a floodplain road, and the protection generally takes the shape of a blanket of large riprap rocks placed on the bank of the stream. Such structures not only degrade aquatic habitat in the area of the project, but also destabilize large parts of river systems by channelizing streams and taking away their capacity to dissipate energy. With more energy available, the stream is more likely to cause erosion elsewhere (National Park Service 1994; USNRCS 1995), creating a tendency for riprap to beget more riprap. This cycle is alluded to on p. 202 of the GMP.			
710				
711	In the past ten years, ONP has experimented with engineered log jams (ELJ's) to help protect infrastructure and mitigate habitat damage by recreating large logjams which dissipate a stream's energy. However, ELJ's are generally used in conjunction with riprap, and at any rate, ELJ's are no magic bullet, as even Tim Abbe, the ELJ expert with whom ONP has consulted, admits. As Kondolf (1996) explains, dynamic river systems are inherently unstable and liable to migrate across their floodplains. Attempts to stabilize them will either eventually fail or else unnaturally lock a river in place, interfering with its natural processes of channel migration and flooding.			
712				
713	5. These cumulative impacts can be seen in Olympic National Park.			
714				
715	While a student at Western Washington University's Huxley College of the Environment in 1996-96, I was hired by ONP via the Environmental Careers Organization to produce a study of streambank alterations in the Park and their long-term implications (Chadd 1997). At that time, I noted that:			
716	" There were at least 30 sites with hardened streambanks in ONP, covering about 5400 m.			
717	" On the Quinault River near the North Shore bridge, there were seven bank-hardening projects, with a cumulative length of 1188 m. in a reach of 5150 m.; along this reach, the bank had been hardened at nearly every outside meander bend that was anywhere near a road.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
718	" On the Hoh River near the Park boundary, there had been a series of riprap projects followed by corresponding bank failures further downstream. More than a thousand meters of riprap had been placed in this reach between 1960 and 1996. This instability may in turn have been abetted by an older bank-hardening project a mile upstream.			
719	" 19 additional sites seemed likely to erode and threaten Park infrastructure.			
720				
721	Though I have not followed ONP streambank alteration in detail since then, I know that a good deal more riprap has been placed. There clearly is a cumulative trend toward extenuation of hardened streambanks.			
722				
723	6. Failure to address these long-term, cumulative impacts will ultimately result in permanent, irretrievable damage to ONP's natural resources.			
724				
725	As Kondolf (1996) points out, if you develop in floodplains, you'll ultimately face the dilemma of either putting your structures at peril, or intervening to lock the river in place. If you do the latter, you are altering natural stream processes, and no amount of ELJ's or other mitigation will recreate what a natural stream does. Over time, ONP's rivers will become more and more managed and less and less natural. These degraded rivers will provide inferior habitat to fish and wildlife, including special status species such as salmon and bull trout. As other factors outside ONP further impact these migratory species, the degradation within ONP will provide yet another factor in these species' decline. The no-return point, of course, is extirpation of populations. As the GMP states on p. 184: "NPS must leave resources and values unimpaired. . . . An impact would be more likely to constitute an impairment to the extent that it affects a resource or value whose conservation is&key to the natural&integrity of the park."			
726				
727	7. The Park has a responsibility to address these impacts proactively instead of continuing with ad-hoc "emergency management".			
728				
729	As the National Park Service Deputy Director recently stated, "We don't just sit back and wait for impairment to happen&we have to stop impacts on park resources before they reach impairment" (AP 9/1/06). In stark contrast, the GMP's Alternative D calls for ad hoc management of floodplains that resembles current management:			
730				
731	Stream channels would continue to be minimally modified in such ways as bank armoring (rip-rapping)&where necessary to protect roads or facilities. . . . Unless determined to be an emergency action to protect road segments or restore access or facilities as a result of flooding, future individual stream modifications would undergo appropriate environmental documentation to identify site-specific impacts and to develop mitigating measures to reduce those impacts before any actions were undertaken. (GMP, p. 314)			
732				
733	The above policies have already been in place at least since passage of NEPA, and most of the streambank alteration I described above has happened in that time. This is clearly a failed policy. Of note in the above passage from the GMP:			
734	" "Emergency actions" can be open to construal, and it's quite easy to label a threatened or washed-out road as an emergency situation and therefore skirt environmental review.			
735	" Even when an action undergoes environmental review, the assessment tends to look at the action in isolation and give only a gloss to cumulative impacts. One example of such gloss is the GMP itself (see below).			
736				
737	8. A more creative and flexible version of Alternative B would meet the Park's responsibility for proactive protection of Park resources.			
738				
739	Alternative B creates a River Zone and sets a goal of minimizing and reducing development in that zone, which would be a good start toward protecting floodplains. Alongside delineation of these zones, I would urge full implementation of desired conditions and strategies mentioned on p. 19:			
740	" Desired condition: Environmental effects associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains are avoided when practicable.			
741	" Strategy: Identify floodplains and facilities located within them.			
742	" Strategy: Inventory flood-prone areas near facilities and roads, and develop a program to proactively protect these using the most current techniques that minimize adverse effects on aquatic and riparian habitats and fluvial processes.			
743	This latter strategy should include a realistic assessment of the long-term costs, both environmental and financial, of maintaining facilities in floodplains, and should propose long-term solutions.			
744				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
745		Some more flexible approaches might be taken than the ones outlined in Alternative B. For instance, on the Hoh, moving the Visitor Center near the Park Entrance might make sense, because it would make the road non-essential and open other options for seasonal closures/openings and gradual removal of the road from the floodplain. On the Sol Duc, however, while it is true that the resort constricts and impacts the river, the major long-term threat to the river is the road, and the resort is a unique attraction that cannot be relocated. And since the road is well out of the floodplain for much of its extent, it could prove cost-effective to move the other parts of the road out of the floodplain, or perhaps explore the idea of building an aerial tramway to the resort, which would not only eliminate floodplain conflicts but also provide a unique rainforest educational opportunity and visitor attraction. (Public/private partnerships and major grants might be sought to fund such an amenity, given its fulfillment of multiple management mandates.) In general, it seems rather			
746					
747		Part B, Specific Comments Related to the GMP and Its Preferred Alternative			
748					
749		Here I will comment on specific parts of the GMP, leading to the conclusion that Alternative D would fail to meet Park mandates when it comes to floodplain management.			
750					
751		p. 63: "All of the alternatives considered reflect the park's desired conditions . . ." Perhaps each alternative reflects some of the desired conditions, but each definitely does not meet all of the desired conditions.			
752					
753		"Each of the alternatives&would&avoid unacceptable resource impacts, meet the park's long-term goals . . ." This statement is not true and misleads the public.			
754					
755		"&choosing by advantages." We are given a list of factors that were weighed when choosing the Preferred Alternative. No mention was given to prioritizing these factors. But as I've explained above, it's imperative to prioritize factors according to Park mandates'in particular, to put natural resource protection first. This apparently was not done.			
756					
757		p. 202: "Cumulative effects to geologic processes within and outside the park are moderate, long-term, and adverse. Implementing the no-action alternative would not add to these effects, and no impairment of geologic resources would occur." The no-action alternative would indeed add to these effects, because of the cumulative impacts of existing and future bank-hardening projects (see #4-6 above).			
758					
759		pp. 203-204: Similar problem with the analysis of hydrology. Cumulative long-term impacts are described as moderate and adverse, but then because other moderate and adverse impacts are occurring outside the Park, the conclusion is that there would be "no impairment of hydrologic resources." This is not true; even without the outside impacts, the long-term cumulative impacts of bank-hardening simply within the Park are significant and adverse, as described above; and the fact that outside impacts are occurring does not absolve the Park from acknowledging its own contribution to adverse impacts.			
760					
761		p. 209: "&bank armoring and channel modifications can have moderate to major adverse effects to fisheries resources in the park. . . Overall, changes to the natural river processes have resulted in lower quality fish habitat along roads and in developed areas&, leading to moderate, long-term, adverse effects." The GMP acknowledges that the no-action alternative could have moderate adverse impacts on special status species. And note that moderate impacts are defined as ones where mitigation is not certain.			
762					
763		p. 239: "Implementing [Alternative B] would contribute a minor to moderate beneficial increment to [impacts on hydrologic systems]. Note my comments in Part A and compare impacts with Alternatives A & D.			
764					
765		p. 313: Same comments as for p. 202. Alternatives D & A are essentially the same when it comes to floodplain management, so describing Alternative D's impact as "slight" and "small" is simply not true. Again, see Part A of my comments.			
766					
767		p. 314: "Stream channels would continue to be minimally modified&" I object to the use of this adjective. "Impacts on hydrological systems from [Alternative D] would be long-term, minor to moderate, and adverse." Using the definition of "moderate" given in the GMP, I would claim that such a projected impact to irreplaceable natural resources would constitute a violation of the Organic Act. I would also object to a long-term projection of only "moderate" impacts, given my discussion in Part A above.			
768					

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
769	p. 315: "Cumulative effects [of all projected future actions in conjunction with Alternative D] would be minor, long-term, adverse and beneficial." This statement is a non-sequitur; the fact that the Elwha dam removal would be beneficial doesn't obviate the fact that a lot of damage will be done over time to the other river systems in the Park (described in the GMP as moderately adverse), threatening their salmonid population units. How one can add these together and conclude only a minor adverse impact is beyond me.			
770				
771	p. 322: "[Alternative D's] contribution to [moderate to major adverse impacts] would be small." However, earlier on the same page it states that "habitat in the park could become some of the only remaining quality habitat on the peninsula." If Alternative D would have possibly major adverse impacts within the Park and the Park might have the only good habitat left, a conclusion that Alternative D's impact would be small seems like a complete abdication of the primary purpose of the National Park System.			
772				
773	p. 349: "There would be little potential for adverse impacts because there would be no major new development." Not true: the existing bank-armoring, plus the future bank-armoring that will be required by continued placement of Park infrastructure in floodplains, has a huge potential for future adverse impacts; see my comments in Part A above.			
774				
775	p. 378: "minor construction&" Many of the Park's bank-hardening projects were only "minor construction" at the time; these "minor" projects can add up to major impacts. See my comments in #7 above. "The proposed action would not have any additional adverse impacts on floodplains and their associated values." Not true'see my comments on p. 349.			
776				
777	Conclusion			
778				
779	By all means maximize the human enjoyment of the Parks, within the context of preservation and restoration of natural systems, but always keep the enjoyment within that context. And teach Park visitors to increase their enjoyment by understanding the natural systems they're seeing. Here the rangers play an essential role by helping to make it feel special to enter a National Park and interpreting the story behind the scenery.			
780				
781	Change is not always a good thing, and it's happening all too fast with Earth's ecosystems. Humans, in tinkering with natural processes, have demonstrated that they can't create systems as sustainable as natural ones. It's important, therefore, that there be some places left on Earth where nature is left to manage on its own, to the extent possible. Here in America, the Parks are the kernel of those places. If for no other reason, we need the Parks to be able to continue to learn Natures' ways, the better to learn to manage the rest of the land which we control.			
782				
783	References:			
784				
785	Chadd, E.A. 1997. Altered Streambanks in Olympic National Park: Balancing a Dual Mandate. Prepared for Olympic National Park under assignment with Environmental Careers Organization and Western Washington University, Huxley College of the Environment. Port Angeles, WA.			
786				
787	Kondolf, G.M. 1996. A cross section of stream channel restoration. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 51(2):119-125.			
788				
789	National Park Service. 1994. Flood Prone Facility Assessment: Olympic National Park, North Cascades National Park, Mount Rainier National Park. National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Seattle, WA.			
790				
791	USNRCS (United States Natural Resources Conservation Service). 1995. Streambank and shoreline protection. Engineering Field Handbook Chapter 16, Draft August 1995. United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.			
792	188560		Seattle	WA
793	I support Alternative D for managing Olympic National Park.			
794	190882	Buckhorn Range	Chimacum	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
795	The Buckhorn Ranger Chapter of the Backcountry Horsemanship is based on the northeast side of the Olympic Peninsula. Most all of our members who weren't born here are local residents who settled in the area at some time in their lives due to their profound love for the Olympic Peninsula, and more explicitly, the Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest. It is not easy to live here economically, and it is only with sheer determination and commitment that we remain a presence on this spectacular corner of the continental United States. We work hard - and we recreate with the same effort. We are outdoors men and women. We ride, pack, and sleep in and along the mountains we love. We also invest with volunteer labor back to keeping trails and facilities open to everyone.	Chapter, Backcountry Horsemen of Washington		
796				
797	We are reviewing the draft General Management Plan. Countless phone calls and discussions have been circulating between us on about what the future of stock use on the ONP should be. Writing formal comments is not an easy matter for packers and trail riders. Many don't feel anywhere near as comfortable reviewing a 400 page document and putting together technical comments as we feel at ease with subjects like proper saddle fitting and clearing logs off trails.			
798				
799	However, the message that we all feel needs to be given is the same one. We want the Olympics to remain open to horses and pack stock. We want that for ourselves, and we want it for future generations of horse riders who will enjoy the same Olympic Mountains that brought us to this part of the world. Horses have played a pivotal role in our nation's history. Help us maintain that tradition by keeping it alive - not just in archives, antique pictures, and buried in pages of a document - but preserved in day to day life on the Olympic Peninsula.			
800				
801	Attached are signatures of support.			
802	191202	Buckhorn Range Chapter, Backcountry	Chimacum	WA
803	Letter on File			
804	191204	Buckhorn Range Chapter, Backcountry	Chimacum	WA
805	Letter on File			
806	190549	Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society	Sequim	WA
807	We appreciate the opportunity to comment on Olympic National Park's General			
808	Management Plan.			
809	The Park's preferred alternative, Alternative D, takes a balanced approach between			
810	resource protection and visitor use. We support Alternative D in its main			
811	provisions. However, we believe portions of Alternative B, which favors resource			
812	protection, should be blended into Alternative D.			
813	Area boundary adjustments proposed in Alternative D total about 16,000 acres.			
814	However, adjusting the Park's boundaries by 87,000 acres, as proposed in Alternative			
815	B, would greatly add to improved watershed and ecological protections.			
816	The larger boundary addition should be the overarching goal of the final			
817	General Management Plan, along with commercial activities continuing at current,			
818	but improved, levels.			
819	1. We support Alternative B's larger boundary adjustments in the five lake areas			
820	(Crescent, Ozette, Hoh, Quinault, and Queets) and the Hoh River corridor			
821	because it will help better protect the habitats important to wildlife.			
822	2. While we support the Plan's concept of upgrading the developed infrastructure			
823	in the front country and relocating some camping and lodging away from			
824	sensitive areas, we do not support increasing the number of camping sites and			
825	lodging facilities. An exception might be in the Ozette area if future Park			
826	Promoting Birding and Conservation as Community Educators, Volunteers, and Stewards			
827	boundaries are expanded...new facilities in clearcuts, away from sensitive			
828	areas, could be considered.			
829	3. River protection corridors should be established to ensure that critical			
830	salmon habitats and natural river processes are protected. This is proposed			
831	in Alternative B. When the Olympic National Forest conducted a			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
832	study in 1990, it found that 14 rivers were considered eligible for federal			
833	Wild and Scenic Rivers designation. We strongly recommend that the			
834	ONP GMP include objectives of adopting Wild and Scenic designation for			
835	the Park's rivers. Congress declared the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to be.			
836	. . "the policy of the United States that certain selected rivers of the Nation			
837	which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable			
838	scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or			
839	other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that			
840	they and their immediate environments shall be protected for the benefit			
841	and enjoyment of present and future generations."			
842	4. We support the Plan's proposal (in both B & D) to establish intertidal			
843	reserves on the Olympic Coast and recommend a wilderness study for the			
844	Lake Ozette region and the lands proposed for adding to ONP.			
845	5. We support bringing ONP's wilderness back to being a more complete,			
846	natural habitat by restoring extirpated species, such as the wolf and fisher.			
847	6. We recommend that seasonal shuttle transportation be provided, and			
848	its use required, on corridors such as the Obstruction Point Road where			
849	dust control is a recurring problem and trailhead parking is limited.			
850	We appreciate the Park's work in producing a thorough, usable, and factual			
851	report, one that is worthy of the Park it represents and is worthy of the			
852	skilled management job the staff currently performs. Thank you for your			
853	attention to our comments.			
854	190698	Llama Ladies	Port Angeles	WA
855	1. Wilderness Area keep open trails, bridges, campsite for hikers and stock			
856	2. Option in plan to partner with NFS and tribes to access trails into areas that cross both boundaries			
857	3. Areas now accessible to public should be enhances i.e. Hurricane Ridge, Deer Park, Marymere etc. Plan C preferred.			
858	4. Better trail to Shi Shi Beach after Makah Reservation Trail ends.			
859	5. Sol Duc Hot Springs Keep Open!! Important tourist destination and popular local use			
860	6. Overall Statement Plan D prefer for all wilderness areas. Plan C prefer for already easily accessible use older generation, children, physically impaired.			
861				
862	190701		Port Angeles	WA
863	Not only would the congestion at Hurricane Ridge be reduced, air quality resources could be better managed if the public transit/shuttle options are implemented.			
864	188680		Seattle	WA
865	While I appreciate the vast amount of data contained in the GMP, it would be nice to have a product one didn't need to digest entirely to find the essential differences between the plans presented. Also, the constant use of generalized, question-begging descriptors, is at odds with any really inciteful analysis of the competing visions for the Park. That said, I'm a lifetime ONP visitor and am aware of two double whammy posed by decreased (or inadequate) federal funding and increased usage of the Park. As I recall, for instance, the overnight visitation rate has more than doubled since my family's camping trips when I was a child in the 60's. I think the preferred plan is fine, though I don't see the Park enduring in prime condition without a much higher level of funding. My first priority would be to upgrade existing features. Many of the original structures have degraded and the quality of established campsites is distinctly poorer and less consistent than those in, for instance, Washington State Parks. It would be nice to see some pressure at high useage points like Hurricane Ridge relieved by better access in genral. So much of the Park is only available to those would want to seriously hike, there's a shorage of experiences for day visitors.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
866	One example would be the Elwa Valley, one of the best pieces of the Park. I don't know what the plan contemplates in terms of the future of dam removal and increased access along one of the feew pristine rivers in the lower 48, but it ought to be regarded as a singular opportunity. Road and trail access on the west, wet side is in need of improvement and there's a huge lack of quality information about the Park in general and discrete areas specifically. Of course, the marker lack of Rangers doesn't help. I'm also all for getting rid of the goats--they shouldn't be there and the pressure on fragile meadows and short season plant life is already too great to allow non-indigenous animals to further damage that extraordinary ecosystem. If these were other than large mammals they would have been gone long ago. Sometimes, someone actually has to make a sensible decisions even in the face of public carping. I'd like to see more, better parking at existing sites throughtout and better trail conditions to the water, e.g. what has been done at Cape Flattery is a nice example of what should be the norm. I'm all for the Intertidal reserve zone.			
867	With the recent disclosure of off shore "dead zones" it's imperative everything be done to perserve existing species and their habitat at water's edge. I'm likewise all in favor of every effort at noise abatement which ought to extend to campsites (i.e.generators) and qualitative restrictions on motorized river traffic (e.g. noise standards). I'm glad the see that what seems to have been the long-standing approach of "benign neglect" for historical structures in the Park is recognized as inadequate. These structures are both rare, even in the NPS, and provide an exceptional experience even for the most casual visitor. Even effort should be made to preserve and protect them. Finally, keep working on the flora identifies and information. One need only look at the figures for August visitation to the Park and appreciate how big a draw the wild flowers are. Plus, there's a great opporunity to educate Americans about the forests that used to be, something most folks can hardly believe. I have been to NPs all over the US and there are few to revial ONP. It should be treated as the national treasure it is.			
868	191007		Sequim	WA
869	Re: the ONP Draft Gen'l Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement			
870				
871	Our brief comments on the Draft reflect our interactions with the			
872	Park and its superb professional staff, as retired North Olympic			
873	Peninsula residents since the late 1980s and active participants			
874	especially in Dungeness River watershed restoration/management			
875	efforts. We have followed the efforts of Brian Winters and others in			
876	restoration of the Elwha River system with great admiration.			
877	Likewise, the efforts of ONP professionals including Paul Crawford,			
878	Bruce Moorhead, Ed Schreiner, the Hoffmans, Jerry Freilich, and many			
879	others over a long term have kept fresh the visions of the Wilderness			
880	Act and the World Heritage Site and the uniqueness of the Olympic Peninsula.			
881				
882	We understand that the Draft reflects short-term planning to keep			
883	alive the long-term potential of the Park in a period of fiscal			
884	tightening within the national government. Alternatives B and D of			
885	the draft plan seem to us the least deleterious of the four proposed			
886	choices. We believe that protection and enlargement of the wilderness			
887	characteristics of ONP are much more important to its future than			
888	increased public accommodation that increases traffic, noise, and			
889	other impacts on the nature preserve. Our experiences in other			
890	National Parks and wilderness/roadless forest areas of the West			
891	leaves us with serious concern that motorized access, especially,			
892	destroys the wilderness character permanently. We recognize that the			
893	public wants and needs more recreational facility, but we would			
894	prefer to see it provided elsewhere, even in National Forests			
895	surrounding the Parks, if necessary.			
896				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
897	In general we approve of the suggestions of Olympic Park Associates'			
898	that would improve the the Draft. We believe that some emergency			
899	shelters are appropriate to safeguard modern hikers in extreme			
900	weather conditions or injuries. But we don't see the necessity to			
901	preserve or renovate historic structures that antedate the Park's			
902	inception. Re-introduction of Wolves, etc, seems an appropriate action.			
903				
904	We endorse the proposed acquisitions in the Crescent Lake area to			
905	protect the Park environment. The incorporation of the 'wilderness'			
906	Ozette Lake area into the Park is exceedingly important, but, as			
907	Olympic Park Associates note, the included territory ought to extend			
908	to the hydrologic boundaries of its supporting streams.			
909				
910	Our strongest suggestions are to develop the Wild & Scenic River			
911	possibilities to the greatest extent possible. Wild & Scenic River			
912	options have been very successful in the West, (Idaho and Oregon),			
913	and could have mitigated some of our problems even on a less wild			
914	system as the Dungeness.			
915				
916	Thanks for the opportunity to comment,			
917	190764	Pacific Northwest Trail Association	Seattle	WA
918	Trail corridors throughout the Park lands and particularly those trails of regional significance should receive concentrated trail maintenance and rehabilitation. Expansion would be a good role after existing trails are brought up to standards. Also, consider that many trail points of interest often are more than 6 miles from trailheads, and therefore it is paramount that access for stock animals be provided so that trail work teams supplied by stock animals can provide necessary maintenance throughout the trail system. Good stock and hiker access becomes a symbiotic relationship in this regard.			
919				
920	The future changes to park visitation for both the new scientific and recreational value caused by the Elwah Dam removal appear to be understated.			
921				
922	With regard to park structures and concessionare facilities I am of the opinion that these need to be built and maintained in a "grander style" consistent with what exists in our other national parks particularly in view of the beautiful timbers harvested from the Olympic Peninsula over the last 100 years. For instance, why are the cabins at Sol Duc Hot Springs odd, non-descript, and reminiscent of cheap dwelling units?			
923				
924	Finally, in the Olympic National Park planning efforts that will come after this General Management Plan is adopted, it will behoove the park service to work closely with the indian tribes in crafting access provisions, and facilities for visitation for the good of the whole.			
925				
926	Thank you for your consideration.			
927				
928	Sincerely,			
929				
930	Daniel Collins, Regional Coordinator PNTA			
931	190620		None	N/A
932	Dear Trustees of the Park:		Provided	
933				
934	In 1998, I had an opportunity to visit the Sol-Duc springs, where I spent time with some of the most beautiful natural surroundings and conscientious humans I had ever met. At that time, I had never seen any warnings about fecal coliform bacteria in the pools. The only off-putting part of the experience was the sulfurous "geyser" odor in the water, but one could get used to that, and it even began to seem therapeutic after a while. I felt energized and relaxed. It was an ideal place to be naked in nature.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
935	I earnestly hope that I, my friends, and my descendants may have the same opportunity in future years. If the springs require a little management, please adopt a plan that balances the natural concerns with the ability of visitors to soak in the pools. The Naturist Action Committee recommends reducing the number of pools, not eliminating them, and maintaining a hikeable trail from the parking lot to the pools.			
936				
937				
938	Naturist visitors will mostly continue to follow the pack-in-pack-out ethos, and many will even clean up after other visitors who do not. They are often willing to yield to the concerns of the ecosystem, even if it means temporarily sacrificing their enjoyment of clothing-optional recreation. But from my own observations, there is no need to put a permanent halt to naturist activity in the park, nor to lose the pools.			
939	190667		Seattle	WA
940	I have enjoyed boat camping on Lake Ozette and would like to continue using Ericson's Bay Trail.			
941	190954	Washington State Department of Natural Resources	Forks	WA
942	The Department of Natural Resources appreciates the opportunity to provide comments relative to the Olympic National Park's (ONP) Draft General Management Plan (GMP).			
943	Several areas of interest to the department were found in the Park's preferred alternative D. The first is relative to the administration of lands added through boundary adjustments both in the Lake Ozette, Lake Crescent, and Queets watersheds. These areas under the preferred alternative discuss an interest by ONP to exchange lands purchased outside of the Parks proposed revised boundaries with DNR, in return DNR, would convey its interest to the subsurface mineral rights within the Park and other state trust lands found within the proposed revised boundaries. The lands conveyed to DNR within the Lake Ozette watershed but outside of the revised boundary for the Park would be required to be managed as a Legacy Forest under an "ecologically sustainable, best practices approach to forest management" (Chapter 1 page 35).			
944	It is unclear how the described guidelines for the management of these proposed exchanged lands, as a "Legacy Forest", would differ from current land management practices by the department. However, adding the additional federal expectations and constraints onto these lands is problematic. If the ONP requires control over the kind of management applied to these lands the DNR would not be supportive of engaging the Park in any land exchange discussions; we believe the departments Habitat Conservation Plan, the Policy for Sustainable Forests, and the Olympic Experimental State Forest, all provide the protections adequate to meet ONP objectives. If this issue were resolved the Department may be interested in discussing possible exchange strategies. At this time, without concrete proposals, it is difficult to provide any further feedback until such time that actual parcels are identified.			
945	We also have some concerns regarding the proposed exchange of subsurface mineral rights for surface rights. The state has statutory limitations on the disposition of these mineral rights, and historically has only executed exchanges of mineral rights when it has been for similar or equal mineral rights. In addition, each parcel of state trust land is designed and managed for a particular trust, with various provisions and exclusions relating to the sale, transfer or exchange of certain trust lands. The exchange of mineral rights as well as surface lands managed for specific trusts, and establishment of a new Legacy Trust, would very likely require legislative action.			
946	A second area of interest is found in Alternative D relative to the proposed relocation of the portions of Hiway 101 in the Kalaloch area. The proposal recommends the relocation of Hiway 101 "out of the park to address threats from coastal erosion and to enhance visitor experience". DNR trust lands abut much of ONP lands in this area and potentially would be significantly impacted by this proposal. The department needs to be engaged in any proposals that affect state trust lands very early in any planning stages relative to the relocation of Hiway 101.			
947	Thirdly, the preferred alternative D calls for including several thousand acres of what is now commercial forestland within the boundary of the Park. It is not clear how the enforcement of the states Forest Practice Act on those lands would be regulated prior to actual purchase by the Park. Forest Practice activities within the park boundary would fall under a Class 4-Special application requiring additional review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). There currently are provisions for the Park Service to administer similar activities, which occur on private inholdings near Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault. DNR would like clarification as to the parks future plans for forest practice administration in these areas.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
948	We would also like to point out an inconsistency in the discussion of rare plant species in the Park. On page 108, under the discussion of Special Status Species, reference is made to a complete list of federal and state special status species in Appendix G. However, no plants are included in this appendix. Also, the short list of USFWS Species of Concern is incorrectly labeled as "Species of Special Concern", and the list of Washington Natural Heritage Program Listed Threatened Species includes two species that are currently on our Review List 2, one sensitive species, and one scientific name that is no longer recognized (<i>Astragalus australis</i> var. <i>olympicus</i> was previously named <i>A. cottonii</i> , but this name is no longer considered valid). These errors are most likely due to referring to the 1997 Natural Heritage list, which has subsequently been revised. The best source of current status and nomenclature for these species can be found on the Natural Heritage Program webpage at www.dnr.wa.gov/nhp .			
949	A potentially more important omission is that plants with special status in the state are present in the Park, could be impacted by Park activities, but are not included in this analysis. We recommend that the analysis of effects include all species that are assigned special status by the Natural Heritage Program.			
950	Lands identified in alternatives B-D at the south end of Lake Ozette include the proposed Bite Hill Natural Area Preserve (NAP). The Washington Natural Heritage Advisory Council recommended and the Commissioner of Public Lands approved the proposed Bite Hill NAP in 1992. The proposed area includes both state trust land (Common School trust) and private land.			
951	The department is additionally exploring ways to protect lands within the South Lake Ozette watershed securing a connection between the current National Park coastal strip and the Bite Hill NAP.			
952	Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comment to the parks plan. The department respects the efforts of the ONP to protect the environmental values and to provide for enhanced opportunities for public enjoyment of these special lands on the Olympic Peninsula. These efforts can be compatible with the department's mission of providing sustainable economic, environmental, and social benefits to the citizens of Washington State.			
953				
954	Sincerely,			
955	Charlie Cortelyou Olympic Region Manager Washington State Department of Natural Resources			
956				
957	cc: Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands Bruce Mackey, Lands Steward Bonnie Bunning, Executive Director of Policy & Administration Kit Metlen, Division Manager, Asset Management & Protection Division Gretchen Nicholas, Division Manager, Land Management Division Jed Herman, Division Manager, Product Sales & Leasing Division			
958	190711		Port Angeles	WA
959	Draft GMP Public Meeting. August 18, 2006. Port Angeles, Washington.			
960				
961				
962	Yeah my comments today are going to be concerning the Elwha alternatives. Specifically the Olympic Hot Springs. As part of the preferred alternative, as well as the resource protection and visitor opportunities emphasis, each of those alternatives indicate a section where it says, "visitor constructed hot spring pools at the Olympic Hot Springs site would be removed and the area would be restored to a natural state."			
963	I prefer the current management plan. That being that the Olympic Hot Springs site would just remain in its existing condition. And it's alright if there are no exhibits or waysides that would be developed. Because that place has been in existence for thousands of years. And people have been damming up the hot springs pools at that place for thousands of years. I would note that in the Port Angeles newspaper just some months ago the Elwha Tribe specifically had a group of teenagers that they took up there to show the historic value of using the hot springs pools that naturally come out of the side of the mountain and there are historic use of the hot springs pools for both spiritual and health reasons.			
964	Now I object to any of the suggestions that you would remove the pools as they currently are. Because frankly I've been going there for the last thirty years. Those pools, frankly, have not changed very much in the last thirty years. Even though they are constructed as small dam sites by locals.			
965	What would happen if you suggest or do an alternative where you start deconstructing those pools is that you're going to have people coming up there constantly rearranging, trying to make new pools so that they can get into the hot spring water. You can't keep people out of the water.			
966	As it is now if you keep the current alternative, it's low impact, it's already been there for decades and nobody is up there building new pools. Nobody is up there enlarging the pools. It's fine the way it is. But if you start tearing apart the pools as they currently exist you're going to create a problem. People are still going to want to go up to Olympic Hot Springs and they're still going to want to get into that water. So you're going to have constant rock rearranging. You're going to have constant soil erosion. You're going to have constant movement of logs and debris in order to create pools big enough for somebody to get in. If you leave it the way that it is it's going to be fine.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
967	If people want to get in the water you know that you can't stop them. So if people are going to get in the water and you're worried that they're going to get sick or that they're going to get choliform bacteria from other people being in that water, well they take that chance. And leave it to them.			
968	My understanding is, and I don't know, if you have received any complaints from people about going in that water and I doubt if anyone has ever complained that they've gotten sick after going to Olympic Hot Springs and going in that hot spring water.			
969	So my suggestion is that you keep the current plan and not switch to an alternative where you're going to create more problems than it's worth. I know that people might complain about the nudity, or people using those pools without clothes. But they're not that accessible for that many people. And those persons who would be offended by that, they have a current alternative to go to Sol Duc Hot Springs and use the facilities there that are built like a regular swimming pool.			
970	So leave it the way that it is. You've got your Sol Duc Hot Springs, which is developed and clearly designated for people to go in and to make sure that it's healthy, etc. And then you've got your more natural alternative to go into the hot springs, which is at Olympic Hot Springs. Which is only accessible by trail. Which you have to hike for a great distance. And specifically when people want to go up there in the winter, and that's the locals here, the only people that go up there in the winter pretty much is the locals. And they're going to be up there building, rebuilding, pools that you have to constantly deconstruct. You don't want to spend time or waste time doing that. Just leave it the way that it is and you're going to have much less problems and much less hassle with people who want to use those hot springs pools.			
971	When it comes to what is natural, what is natural is people using the water. And people are going to use the water no matter what you suggest. So just leave it the way that it is. It's worked for the last thirty years since Olympic Hot Springs itself pretty much fell apart and the road fell apart. So just leave it the way that it is. Thank you. That's all that I have for my comments.			
972				
973	191213			
974	I am a member of the Peninsula Chapter of the Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, which is based on the northwest side of the Olympic Peninsula. Most all of our members who weren't born here are local residents who settled in the area at some time in their lives due to their profound love for the Olympic Peninsula, and more explicitly, the Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest. It is not easy to live here economically, and it is only with sheer determination and commitment that we remain a presence on this spectacular corner of the continental United States. We work hard - and we recreate with the same effort. We are outdoors men and women. We live, ride, pack, and sleep in and along with the mountains and forests we love. We also invest with thousands of hours of volunteer labor towards keeping trails and facilities open to everyone.		Port Angeles	WA
975				
976	Our Directors are reviewing the draft General Management Plan. Countless phone calls and discussions have been circulating between us about what the future of stock use on the ONP should be. Writing formal comments is not an easy matter for packers and trail riders. Many don't have the time nor are we comfortable reviewing a 400 page document and putting together technical comments, though we manage to find time and inclination to pack our saws and tools into the ONP to help clear and maintain trails.			
977				
978	Recently, we talked with a solicited signatures from many people at our Clallam County Fair. We found that equestrians and non-equestrians alike have very strong feelings about the continued use of horses and mules in the backcountry. People here understand that the history of this National park and the continued maintenance of backcountry trails is made possible because of the hard work of the horse and riders.			
979				
980	We want the Olympics to remain open to horses and pack stock. We want that for ourselves, and we want it for future generations of horse riders who will enjoy the same Olympic Mountains that brought us to this part of the world. Horses have played a pivotal role in our nation's history. Help us maintain that tradition by keeping it alive - not just in archives, antique pictures, and buried in pages of a document - but preserved in day to day life on the Olympic Peninsula.			
981	190941			
982	As a recreational user of stock in the back country, including wilderness areas of our state for over 26 years, I am deeply concerned that using your proposed zoning as a method of management that precludes and or further restricts use of horses and other stock animals, does eliminate any future opportunity to use these areas permanently. I do not agree with any idea that restricts access to such a limited scope as a designated subset of trails in the Wilderness Trail Zone.			
983				
984	I support the weed free certified feed requirement criteria, but I respectfully request that any restrictions that limit future use of stock or restrict their use to existing trails be eliminated.			
985				
986	If your draft plan is adopted, I believe that future access to many varied users, including stock users, will be adversely affected.		None Provided	N/A

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
987				
988	I request that any such restrictions proposed in the Draft General Management Plan/EIS for the Olympic National Park be dropped from your plan.			
989	190736		Quinault	WA
990	Changing the roadside zone from the lake up to the upper boat launch from low use zone to day use zone is not good. This change puts in more restrictions on our freedom in this area.			
991				
992	having visited many national parks in the west, I consider Olympic National Park the most unfriendly. It is as if they want no one to use it.			
993				
994	Please maintain what you have in the Quinault valley and put fewer, not more restrictions on us.			
995	190682		Bremerton	WA
996	Thank you for our wonderful Olympic Nat'l Park! I hope the management places resource protection as a high priority for the plan. This is in alignment with the purpose of the park as presented in the powerpoint presentation.			
997				
998	Specifically I would support keeping Deer Park access road unpaved etc and support alternative B with D as my secondary choice. As a frequent visitor to this area I appreciate the current access via auto, and access to the trails.			
999				
1000	I would also support alternative B primarily followed by D for all areas in the park due to the importance of preserving this unique ecosystem which also provides visitors with a wonderful wilderness experience (at all levels).			
1001	190676	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington	Olympia	WA
1002	I am a member of the capitol riders chapter of the Backcountry Horsemen. My concern is that some of these changes will block riders from the trails.			
1003	190817		None Provided	N/A
1004	Dear Sirs,			
1005				
1006	My understanding is Citizens who have leased property in the ONP and have been able to pass that Lease on to Family Members will no longer be able to do so, when the present lease expires? If this is true, it grieves me because it's so nice to have a piece of land where you are not crowded with other people around. I would truly be against having the leases given up so more park land could be included in the present park acreage. Thank you.			
1007	190705	Aramark Lake Quinault Lodge	Quinault	WA
1008	Quinault Area: The need for a ranger for the interpretive program is great. The visitors have noticed no rangers for guided hikes and educational programs.			
1009				
1010	Bike land needed at least down to all businesses. High volumes of bikes go through this area in the summer time.			
1011	190529		Westwood	MA
1012	I think that NONE of the four proposed alternatives of the Park Service adequately addresses Olympic Hot Springs.			
1013				
1014	I support the following three key amendments that have been suggested to Park Service management by the Naturist Action Committee:			
1015				
1016	A. Retain soaking at Olympic Hot Springs, but reduce the number of pools			
1017	at the Springs site to three or four, located near the main source. This			
1018	will improve cleanliness by offering less restriction to flow. It will			
1019	help rehabilitate the runoff area, reduce the impact of use and enhance			
1020	the integrity of the environment.			
1021				
1022	B. Contract the maintenance of the resource to an experienced caretaker.			
1023	This approach has been implemented with great success by other agencies			
1024	responsible for managing hot spring resources in the Pacific Northwest.			
1025				
1026	C. Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail beyond the			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1027	Altair site. This is similar to an item proposed in Alternative B of the			
1028	draft of the General Management Plan.			
1029	As a practicing Naturalist, I also know that:			
1030				
1031	1. Clothing-optional use at traditional sites in the park is an			
1032	environmentally friendly, low impact use of the resource.			
1033				
1034	2. Naturalists are responsible stewards of public lands.			
1035				
1036	3. "Rehabilitation" of Olympic Hot Springs does not require that the			
1037	resource be made unusable for those seeking remote recreational			
1038	experiences. Other details of Alternative D, the NPS-preferred plan,			
1039	accommodate traditional uses, and the traditional use at Olympic Hot			
1040	Springs should be among those that are retained.			
1041	190914		Port Townsend	WA
1042	I would like to thank you for putting on the open house August 10th in Port Townsend. Because of the location I was able to attend and learn quite about the GMP/EIS for the Olympic National Park.			
1043				
1044	As a day hiker, backpacker and stock user of the Olympic National Park, I appreciate the opportunity for input. While I cannot say that I have reviewed in detail the 400 page document I was very pleased to see that under the GMP/EIS there were no wilderenss deletions proposed. However, I did note that some of the proposals would eliminate stock use in primitive wilderness zone. I would point out that such zone has historically permitted stock use and I would urge stock use be continued. If you find that impacts from stock use in the primitive zone degrades the environment perhaps you could institute a lottery system so stock use can be preserved along with the preservation of primitive wilderness.			
1045				
1046	In most cases, in the draft GMP, the preferred alternatives appear to meet all goals. There is however an area of concern. In some cases where trail access to stock is permitted there is no concomitant commitment for road access to the trail head for stock vehilces. Just one example of this dilemma is the Dosewallips trailhead.			
1047				
1048	In conclusion, please maintain all historic stock use in the Olympic National Park. Make the use more than symbolic by preserving road access to the trailheads along with the designation 'open to stock use.'			
1049				
1050	Thank you very much for your work on the Olympic National Park. If there is anything I can do to preserve this treasure please let me know. I can handle a pulaski.			
1051	191162	Port Gamble S'Klallam	Kingston	WA
1052	Letter on File	Tribe Natural		
1053	188265		Sequim	WA
1054	Overall, I think Alternative D is very good and will be a sound management plan for Olympic National Park.			
1055				
1056	I do have a proposed change for the Queets plan. I recommend including in the final plan a pedestrian bridge across the Queets River to the trail would be provided, as stated in point 2 of Queets Alternative C. It makes no sense to have the barrier of a major river crossing deny hiker access to such an outstanding rain forest area for much of the year for almost everyone and at all times for the majority of hikers who feel it is unsafe to wade such a large river.			
1057				
1058	Thank you for your consideration of this suggestion.			
1059	190902		Edmonds	WA
1060	I read your article in the newspaper inviting people to read and comment on future plans for Olympic National Park.			
1061				
1062	I feel the Olympic Park should continue to be managed as it is now.			
1063				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1064	Any National Park should be open to the public as taxpayer money supports it. However I don't think the Olympic Peninsula needs the 3 ring circus Yellowstone has become. And there is no money available for development for tourists anymore.			
1065	191206		Carlsborg	WA
1066	I have reviewed the Draft General Management Plans for changing the boundaries around Lake Ozette. I strongly feel that neither plans B, C, or D be implemented. I might feel differently if the timber companies had not been allowed to clear cut most all of the proposed 12,000 acres around Ozette. I do not wish to have my tax dollars given to Timber companies who have already raped the land for profit once. Clear cuts "do not a wilderness make."			
1067				
1068	Private land owners will be affected as some of the land around Ozette was homesteaded years ago and family still dwell there.			
1069				
1070	I like Ozette the way it is. I am unable to paddle a canoe or kayak. I greatly enjoy motoring around the lake.			
1071				
1072	I support alternative a, change nothing. I absolutely oppose alternatives B, C, and D. Please consider my plea.			
1073	190510		Harmony	N/A
1074	I would like to add my comments on the Draft G.M.P. for the O.N.P. .			
1075				
1076				
1077	1. As a first time visitor to the peninsula and the O.N.P. this summer, I was overwhelmed by my experience and am filled with gratitude for those park service employees, past and present who have made it their work to preserve the land within the boundaries of the park. Thank you.			
1078				
1079	2. The establishment of intertidal reserves on the Olympic Coast and the proposed wilderness study for Ozette Lake are both important and welcome aspects of the Draft Plan.			
1080				
1081	3. The current size of developed areas and zones as outlined in Alternative Plan A are preferable. New development, recreational and otherwise, should happen outside the boundaries of O.N.P.in recognition of the park's wilderness heritage.			
1082				
1083	4. The expanded park boundaries as proposed in Alternative B for Ozette, Lake Crescent and the watersheds of the Hoh, Queets and Quinault should be adopted.			
1084				
1085	5. River protection zones to protect natural river processes as outlined in Alternative B should be established. All 13 major river systems on the peninsula should be recommended for Wild and Scenic River status.			
1086				
1087	6. The restoration of the both the Wolf and the Fisher to the O.N.P. should be a top wildlife priority.			
1088				
1089	7. A comprehensive Wilderness Management Plan needs to completed. Until such a plan is in place, decisions effecting designated wilderness should be deferred.			
1090	188616		unknown	N/A
1091	I don't know if this is the correct medium to provide comment (though I suspect any medium is authorized), but I did just want to write and let it be known that I would most definitely prefer LESS DEVELOPMENT, preferably absolutely no "modern or commercial" of the park, please keep it as pristine and non-commercial as possible.			
1092	188662		Seattle	WA
1093	We need to keep the Hot Springs pools as is. I enjoy hiking up to the springs and relaxing out there in the wilderness. It really is the only time I've gone to the Olympic National Forest. Please don't get rid of the pools.			
1094	191004		Port	WA
1095	To Whom it May Concern:		Angeles	
1096				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
1097	I have read carefully the Olympic Park Associate's recommendations and agree with them. I would like to particularly urge the park not to extend development zones in the park, especially not to increase the size of campgrounds used by RV vehicles, but instead to emphasize trail maintenance for those of us using the park for its intended wilderness function. I was in fact shocked when I read their recommendations, realizing how much development was being proposed. A national park is not supposed to be a developed area.				
1098					
1099	As usual, I hiked the park quite a bit this summer, and I was sorry to see trails in such bad shape. In addition, I was sorry to see ranger supervision time cut at backcountry campsites. Lack of a ranger only encourages people to believe they do not have to follow any rules while backcountry camping. I am amazed at hikers' lack of concern for plant life; the Park should be putting more money into education.				
1100					
1101	In addition, I would urge the Park to establish river protection zones and to recommend all eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic river designation.				
1102					
1103	I would urge the Park to eliminate mountain goats from the park and consider reintroducing a predator species such as the wolf.				
1104					
1105	188363		American Forest Resource Council	Olympia	WA
1106	American Forest Resource Council is an association of the forest industry representing that part of the industry that uses public and open market timber in its manufacturing operations. Our primary concern, and reason for commenting, is maintenance of the Olympic Peninsula's operable timberland base. We appreciate the opportunity to comment.				
1107					
1108	The Olympic National Park (ONP) Draft Plan proposes to exchange a significant amount of land with a variety of landowners, including the State of Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Exchanges with the State of Washington include lands adjacent to Lake Ozette and the Queets Corridor.				
1109					
1110	Very little information is provided to discern if the proposed exchanges are in the best interest of all parties. There is no recognition or discussion, for example, of the State of Washington's fiduciary responsibility related to trust land management. On the contrary, the draft suggests an exchange with conditions that significantly encumber DNR's proposed new land base. That violates DNR's Constitutional mandate to manage the lands for revenue production and likely is illegal.				
1111					
1112	The draft proposed to expand the Queets Corridor northwest face using private timberland as the exchange medium. The Olympic Peninsula timber base already is substantially encumbered with various environmental and habitat requirements; the draft plan further reduces an encumbers these lands. The following subjects should be explored in future planning documents and discussions:				
1113					
1114	" DNR has specific requirements to manage its lands for revenue production, requirements which must be examined before exchanges can be pursued (Draft Plan at pp 35, 370, 372, and M57-60).				
1115	" The Olympic National Park should not encumber proposed exchanges with its vision of land management (p 35).				
1116	" The draft proposed that the federal government purchase private forestland for use as trading stock. That may make sense on a parcel-by-parcel basis but should not substantially reduce the productive timberland base (pp 35, 372).				
1117	" If ONP wants to pursue land base expansion, National Forest lands in the same vicinity should be used as the exchange medium instead of private lands.				
1118					
1119	The following additional issues deserve comment.				
1120					
1121	Ozette Stream Sedimentation				
1122					
1123	The draft at page 36 states, "Recurring timber harvesting adjacent to (the Ozette Lake shoreline) could result in & increase (sic) sedimentation and erosion of rivers and streams that drain into Ozette Lake. Sedimentation has, and is expected to continue to have, severe adverse impacts on salmon spawning and survival in area tributary streams and river gravels&"				
1124					

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1125	Early forest harvest activities could and did- cause sedimentation. Forest practices regulation on non-federal forestlands, however, is several generations removed from the original Ozette area logging. Water quality and fish habitat protection are paramount goals of more recent forest practices regulation, the effect of which is borne out in increased adult salmon returns. Draft writers should either support the above statement with proof or remove the offending language.			
1126				
1127	Regional Economy			
1128				
1129	The draft's discussion of the area economy (PP 162-174) seriously is flawed. The forest industry is the regional industry and isn't even mentioned in this discussion; employment and manufacturing data provide no hint of the importance of the forest industry based economy. Conversely, the draft opines service jobs drives the economy. Nothing could be further from the truth.			
1130				
1131	If this document is to have any socio-economic credibility, writers must properly document the forest industry's economic impact, covering forest management, timber harvest and transportation, milling, secondary manufacturing and retail products. Total product value and payroll will be on the order of a billion dollars and 100 million dollars respectively. The forest industry is the Olympic Peninsula's economic engine and should be recognized as such in future documents.			
1132				
1133	Finally, the draft states at Page 166 that the region "&may be economically disadvantage." That is correct. Federal land management policy changes essentially eliminated regional National Forest timber harvest in the early 1990's, an action from which the region is just beginning to recover.			
1134				
1135	Impacts on Natural Resources (Air Quality)			
1136				
1137	The draft cites USFS studies that show nitrogen sensitive lichens are largely absent along the I-5 corridor (Draft at p 235). That states the obvious; the corridor is largely urban or pastoral with scattered forest cover. Remaining forests are young, either second or third growth commercial forests where lichens would not be expected to be common. Finally, millions of cars and trucks use Interstate 5, each day, contributing a variety of air pollutants. Impacts do not come as a major surprise.			
1138				
1139	What connection is there between Interstate 5-related air quality impacts and vehicle use within Olympic National Park? Absent some documented connection, this discussion is superfluous and misleading.			
1140				
1141	It appears the above discussion, in part, influences plans to remove roads and other developed areas from the park. It is interesting to note a concurrent elevated concern over increased citizen use of the park, the solution of which is more access and developed areas, not fewer.			
1142				
1143	Citizens' abilities to use a national park change as the US population ages. Additional access should be the park's goal. Using logic that includes the discussion of Interstate 5's NOX production does not serve well the people who will make decisions related to park use.			
1144				
1145	Global Warming			
1146				
1147	The Draft at Page 313 states: "Human activities are producing global climate changes." This is an irresponsible statement and has no place in a government sponsored document. Human activities may have an affect on global temperature; they may not. Scientists consistently urge extreme caution when making assumptions about climate change cause and affect.			
1148				
1149	In addition, there is a significant difference between model predictions and actual temperature measurements, a difference the draft authors obviously do not grasp. This discussion is best reserve for qualified scientists in appropriate journals, not a draft park management plan.			
1150				
1151	Summary			
1152				
1153	The draft plan approaches Olympic National Park management from a philosophy of protecting it from the citizens of this country. All US citizens own their park and should have reasonable access to it. Local citizens have a special relationship with their park and should be recognized for what they provide, e.g. a viable economy, which allows those citizens to use their park.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1154	We encourage a careful examination of why the Olympic National Park exists. A balance of protection and development is required in which all citizens can enjoy the park and all its amenities.			
1155				
1156	In closing, we hope planners recognize the forest industry's importance to the Olympic Peninsula; that they more carefully analyze the impacts of land trades and pursue land trade options that do not reduce the region's operable timberland base. A healthy economy will benefit the Olympic National Park and all citizens of the Olympic Peninsula.			
1157				
1158				
1159	Thank you for the opportunity to comment.			
1160				
1161	Sincerely,			
1162				
1163	Malcolm R. Dick, Jr.			
1164	Washington Manager			
1165	190924	Seacrest Land Development Corp	Port Angeles	WA
1166	I am responding to your draft plan as it regards the Kalaloch area. As the former owner of Kalaloch Lodge, I am aware that Kalaloch Lodge must be moved in the near future, due to erosion problems undercutting the present structure.			
1167				
1168	The Seacrest Land Development Corp would be glad to entertain the possibility of moving the lodge 3 1/2 miles south on ocean front property in order to preserve this historic structure and its continual use, as well as allowing the park to reduce commercial activity on National Park land, a long stated National Park objective.			
1169				
1170	Please contact me at [above address] for more information.			
1171	191218	Quillayute Valley Schools	Forks	WA
1172	Schools and communities depend upon a healthy economic base, and a stable tax base. The Olympic National Park General Management Plan threatens both. The acquisition of productive land, the change in status of Trust Lands to Legacy Forest Lands, and the restriction placed on property by wild and scenic designation are not in the best interest of our communities, schools, or students.			
1173				
1174	School funding is driven by school enrollment and the passage of maintenance and operation levies and school bonds. A loss of timberlands and the restrictions put on other lands would result in the loss of local jobs. For example, alternative B calls for the removal of Kalaloch Lodge with the immediate loss of 60 paid employees and the trickle down from the lost revenue would hurt all of the local businesses.			
1175				
1176	We are a property tax poor district. Any additional cuts in private property would severely hamper the school district's ability to pass levies and bonds. The removing of lands that generate timber excise tax and taking those lands off the tax rolls would cut like a double-edged sword. The timber excise tax reduces the amount property owners pay per thousand dollars of assessed value. Taking land out of private ownership would increase the amount of taxes the remaining private land owners must pay for the district to generate the same dollar amount.			
1177				
1178	The Board of Directors of Quillayute Valley School District is against expansion of Olympic National Park, and/or additional restrictions on state or private lands other than those regulations already in place. The Board of Directors approved these comments at the regular board meeting on September 26, 2006.			
1179	191154		Port Angeles	WA
1180	Letter on File			
1181	191185		Seattle	WA
1182	Keep the park wild. Maintain what you have. Save the historic structures. Keep it safe for the rangers. Keep up the good work on research.			
1183				
1184	I'm afraid of over development and too many motorized vehicles and people. Let's keep our park beautiful and wild!			
1185				
1186	Thanks for all of your hard work in maintaining the most beautiful park in the lower 48.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1187	191020	Clallam County Commissioner	Port Angeles	WA
1188	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan/EIS (GMP) for the Olympic National Park.			
1189				
1190	For many decades, the federal government has assisted in conserving "outstanding segments of our native landscape for public inspiration and enjoyment" in our region. In 1909, with the creation of the Mount Olympus National Monument, the federal government established a permanent reserve in the center of the Olympic Peninsula. Expansion of the reserve has generally benefited the economy and the quality of life of our citizens.			
1191				
1192	When President Franklin D. Roosevelt visited the Olympic Peninsula in 1937, he stated that we must look fifty years ahead to set aside an appropriate park resource for future generations. It is long past fifty years since his visit and significant areas have been added to the Park, expanding Roosevelt's initial "Olympic National Park." The "future generations" in Roosevelt's mind have generally found the park very adequate.			
1193				
1194	At this time, we do not endorse any of the large boundary expansions proposed in the draft plan. In the area near Lake Crescent, we would appreciate much more scientific analysis prior to further consideration by the Park to include habitat protection to the Beardslee and Crescenti fish stock.			
1195				
1196	Applied to some areas of the Park, a further analysis of "River Zones" seems appropriate. Local, state, tribal, and federal government agencies and private land owners are working to restore Salmon habitat and an expansion of the "River Zone" concept may be appropriate along some rivers.			
1197				
1198	For decades, the Quileute Tribe has been involved in boundary disputes with the US National Park Service. We appreciate the Olympic National Park administrator for continuing to negotiate with the Tribe to try to reach mutually agreeable solutions to the boundary disputes and the need for additional lands to be incorporated within an expanded Reservation. We are hopeful that the negotiations will reach a meaningful conclusion soon so the Quileute Tribe can expand housing and other infrastructure outside of the tsunami zone.			
1199				
1200	The regional economy of our area is diversifying but continues to rely significantly on natural resources, particularly forest and marine resources. While industries related to both of these areas have declined in recent decades, they remain significant anchors to our economy.			
1201	In the GMP socio-economic impact analysis, more work is needed to clarify and predict impacts to the local economy. The loss of commercial forest lands, through proposed boundary adjustments, will have a significantly greater impact on our local economy than the draft GMP states. We believe that primary and secondary employment loss with the timber industry will be far greater than GMP states.			
1202				
1203	The maximum possible withdrawal from the commercial forest land base appears to be 60,000 acres. It has been estimated that this would equate to approximately the annual supply/throughout of one modern mill on the Peninsula. Private businesses, local governments, and other area economic development groups have been looking for ways to attract another mill to the Peninsula which could find a niche in the diversification and value-added evolution of the forest products industry.			
1204				
1205	An additional, local regional economic development project, involved siting energy generation facilities in this region which would use mill waste and forest residuals as a fuel source. The withdrawal of commercial forest land base will impact this economic development project; the lack of analysis of the impacts of such withdrawals would appear to conflict with both state and national public policy which encourage development of alternate energy sources.			
1206				
1207	The GMP proposes that the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) managed as a "Legacy Forest," a large block of presently privately held commercial forest. The record of the DNR's "Legacy Trust" program is yet to be developed. Only a couple of years old, this program has seen little activity and has no record of precedent. The DNR has a duty under the State Constitution to manage the majority of lands under their jurisdiction to benefit trusts. Management for preservation has not been a traditional role for the DNR. The National Park Service should consult with trust beneficiaries before further pursuing this concept.			
1208				
1209	The public comment record reflects a serious concern, stated primarily by representatives of the timber industry, that the GMP fails to acknowledge provisions of the Washington State Forest Practices Act and the Habitat Conservation Plan as adequately meeting compliance with the Endangered Species Act protective measures. The GMP process should further discuss these habitat conservation requirements and analyze their adequacy when applied to lands subject to the GMP.			
1210				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1211	We support an ecosystem management approach. A holistic management strategy is appropriate for the conservation of ecological functions. Several of the proposed boundary modifications may support the ecosystem management concept; however, more scientific analysis should be performed and presented to the public. In the future, the Park Service should provide more interpretive and education programs regarding the importance of this concept.			
1212				
1213	Any discussions of boundary modifications and restrictions on the use of federal lands should include consideration of federal impact funds provided to area local governments to affect the loss of property taxes, timber excise taxes, etc. Existing federal programs, including the Payments-in-Lieu-of-Taxes (PILT) program and the Secure Schools and Communities Act are inadequate at this time.			
1214				
1215	Although the PILT program is regularly reauthorized, it has never been fully appropriated. And the Secure Schools and Communities program expires this year. While we continue to request an extension of the existing program and a solution to permanent funding, factually this program is not a reliable source of financial impact mitigation.			
1216				
1217	The potential loss of state revenue covered by withdrawing additional lands from the commercial forest base could be very significant to Clallam County and other local government entities. This impact should be further analyzed and mitigation proposals presented for review and comment.			
1218				
1219	Access to traditional recreational activities, valued by generations of Clallam County residents and visitors, should be maintained. For example, skiing at Hurricane Ridge and boating on Lake Ozette.			
1220				
1221	Future expansion of recreational facilities (RV parks, restaurants, lodging) should be encouraged outside of the boundaries of ONP to preserve the current level of protection of park resources and to stimulate private involvement outside of the Park.			
1222				
1223	Support for public transportation of visitors seems very appropriate for several areas of the Park. Particularly, the route to/from Hurricane Ridge should be subject to a phase-in of a public transit shuttle.			
1224				
1225	We commend the Olympic National Park administration for the expansion of the cultural resource program in the last decade. Preserving the history of Native Americans and White settlement in the areas included into the jurisdiction of Olympic National Park remains a valued service to tribes, pioneer families, and visitors alike. Please maintain and expand cultural resource programs.			
1226				
1227	We appreciate the working relationship we have with the Olympic National Park staff related to the planning and construction of the Olympic Discovery Trail. Future generations will be grateful that the Park assisted with this project.			
1228				
1229	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Draft General Management Plan for the Olympic National Park.			
1230	190996		Olympia	WA
1231	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Park General Management Plan.			
1232				
1233	Please - no new developed areas in Olympic National Park.			
1234	Please - preserve every bit of undisturbed wilderness in Olympic National Park as undisturbed wilderness, and return all possible areas to that state.			
1235				
1236	As a Professor of Botany and Horticulture at South Puget Sound Community College, as a former Biological Technician/Plants at Olympic National Park, as a property owner on the Dungeness River in Sequim and at Lake Dawn on the edge of the Park, and as a lifelong resident of Western Washington, I urge you to preserve every possible inch of wilderness, and to extend the Park wherever possible. I've hiked most of the trails in Olympic and explored its great diversity of plant communities. I've led students on field trips to explore undisturbed ecosystems. I've watched non-native weeds, such as Herb Robert (<i>Geranium robertianum</i>), get established along roads and other areas of machinery use, up Peabody Creek and the Elwha and Soleduck Rivers. If wilderness is not aggressively preserved, if roads, machinery and structures spread farther into the backcountry, invasive non-native plants will continue to spread and the integrity of Olympic's plant and animal communities will be lost.			
1237				
1238	I urge you to preserve the Olympic Wilderness for generations to come. Thank you.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1239	191155		Seattle	WA
1240	Letter on File			
1241	190718	Clallam Bay Sekiu Chamber of Commerce	Clallam Bay	WA
1242	After careful and comprehensive review of the Draft General Management Plan for Olympic National Park , dated May 2006, the Clallam Bay-Sekiu Chamber of Commerce has come to the conclusion that we can and will only endorse plan A, under which no changes in the current management strategies would occur.			
1243				
1244	We oppose plans B, C, & D and all they imply.			
1245				
1246	While we applaud your efforts to manage this unique and diverse park property, we feel that the current management plan is a good mix of resource protection and economic support for the Clallam Bay-Sekiu area.			
1247				
1248	Our Community is already very economically depressed and we rely upon the resources and recreation opportunities that Olympic National Park offers our visitors. Any decline in these services could have dire consequences to many businesses and the livelihood of their owners.			
1249				
1250	We feel that there are too many places in the 2006 Draft Plan that are vague, ambiguous and open to the interpretation of anyone with an agenda in the future.			
1251				
1252	We thank you for this opportunity to comment on how Olympic National Park will be managed over the next couple of decades and urge you to stay with the current management plan.			
1253				
1254	188652		Snohomish	WA
1255	I would like to go on record as favoring Plan D. A small improvement in access and public uses of the Park on the Park's edges while not expanding the existing roads and facilities into the interior appears to be a good mix to accommodate public needs.			
1256	188615		Seattle	WA
1257	I just read a blurb about the new management plan in the Seattle Times. I'd like to cast my vote to preserve the park as a natural, wild area. We have enough wild places that have been adapted for human beings to invade, let's preserve our beautiful Olympic National Park as a natural ecosystem.			
1258				
1259	191174		Seattle	WA
1260	Letter on File			
1261	191022	Wilderness Watch	Missoula	MT
1262	Dear Wilderness Stewards,			
1263				
1264	Wilderness Watch submits the following comments on Olympic National Park's General Management Plan (GMP) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).			
1265				
1266	Wilderness Watch is a national conservation organization dedicated to ensuring ongoing protection for the lands and waters within the National Wilderness Preservation System and Wild & Scenic Rivers System. Our mission is to assure that the wilderness character of these special places is preserved and not allowed to diminish over time.			
1267	Approximately 95% of Olympic NP is designated wilderness, and 378 acres are designated as potential wilderness. The park also contains a number of rivers that may be eligible for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, but that have never been studied for such a recommendation. Our comments on the draft GMP will therefore focus primarily on wilderness and the status of rivers in the park. Our wilderness comments will also highlight the issue of historical structures currently present within the designated wilderness portion of the park.			
1268				
1269	Wild & Scenic Rivers			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1270	While we are pleased that the GMP's preferred alternative (D) addresses potential Wild & Scenic River designation for the Elwha River, we are mystified as to why none of the other free-flowing rivers in the park are addressed. The GMP will provide multi-year management direction for the entire park, so it seems appropriate for such a comprehensive plan to evaluate the qualities and suitability for all rivers in the park, rather than singling out just one while ignoring the others. As a park-wide planning document a GMP should not present a piecemeal approach to the future of the park's many natural resources. What is the rationale for not evaluating the other rivers in this plan?			
1271	Wilderness Watch requests that the Final GMP include management direction to evaluate all rivers in the park for possible Wild & Scenic designation, and forward those recommendations forward prior to the next GMP planning cycle.			
1272				
1273				
1274	Wilderness Character			
1275	Although the vast majority of the park is designated wilderness, the draft GMP's preferred alternative appears to subordinate that fact in favor of greater emphasis on other aspects of the park, such as new visitor developments and an inordinate emphasis on historic structures in the park. The draft plan contains very little discussion on how various management actions will affect the wilderness character of the Olympic Park Wilderness.			
1276	Since preservation of wilderness character is the overarching statutory mandate of the Wilderness Act, downplaying the importance of the park's wilderness character is either an intentional oversight or a sign that park staff and the GMP's planners have little grasp of the provisions and intent of the Wilderness Act. While we may sympathize with there possibly being a paucity of technical expertise within the planning team in regard to wilderness, it nonetheless is imperative that the complex qualities and values of wilderness character be fully incorporated into discussions regarding most management actions described in the plan. This may require seeking outside expert assistance with this aspect of the plan, but nonetheless NEPA requires that this major component of the park be fully evaluated in terms of how a variety of proposed management actions may cumulatively affect the area's wilderness character.			
1277	Despite the recent court ruling against NPS in Olympic Park Associates v. Mainella (2005), the draft GMP indicates that NPS will continue maintaining all structures in wilderness that are eligible or listed on the national historic register. There is no explanation in the plan as to how this fits with the Wilderness Act.			
1278	In 2005 the court ruled against NPS because the Wilderness Act does not allow maintaining and replacing structures in wilderness, the ruling was not based on the fact that the Low Divide and Home Sweet Home shelters were newly-constructed pre-fabs. New or old, the Wilderness Act does not allow maintaining structures in wilderness unless they are the minimum necessary for administration of wilderness. The structures identified in the draft GMP do not meet that test.			
1279	Furthermore, in the 2005 decision, the court pointed out that the National Historic Preservation Act does not require physical maintenance and retention of historic structures, it only requires that the historical value of such structures be recorded. Olympic NP was classified as a national park, not as a national historic site. And, as the 2005 court ruling notes, the wilderness classification places an additional new overlay on the landscape and the values that NPS is obligated to preserve at Olympic NP and Wilderness. Old pioneer structures and "historic landscapes" are not on an equal footing in terms of NPS' statutory obligations at Olympic, and have no primacy over NPS' obligation to preserve the natural environment and wilderness character of the area.			
1280	We therefore hope to see some major changes in the Final GMP in regard to greatly expanding the plan's emphasis on wilderness protection and a substantial modification to the draft plan's incorrect over-emphasis on maintaining evidence of historic human settlement and modifications of the natural landscape.			
1281				
1282				
1283	New Developments			
1284	Wilderness Watch questions the expanded developments proposed for non-wilderness portions of the park, including substantial increases in the number of developed front-country campsites. The draft plan provides no compelling reason for most of the new developments. Most, including additional campground space, is best provided by communities outside the park. Indeed, NPS' new management policies place increased emphasis on coordinating with gateway communities. Instead of using taxpayer dollars to further develop the park it would benefit local communities to have the economic opportunity to provide such services and amenities.			
1285	Although it may be true that visitation has substantially increased over the years, it is not desirable for the park to pave over and develop the park's natural landscape to accommodate increased use. Accommodations for increased visitation are most appropriately pursued outside the park. If the park cannot readily handle current or expected future levels of day-use or backcountry visitors, then the park should consider placing limits on daily visitation, rather than further develop the park to accommodate it. Daily limits are not unheard of -- many parks have overnight camping limits on certain trails, and the McNeil River in Alaska has limits on how many visitors per day are allowed for the popular bear-viewing experience.			
1286	Preserving the unique values and special experience of our parks is NPS' core mission, not accommodating and catering to unlimited numbers of visitors. NPS' new management policies re-affirm this central mission.			
1287	Conclusion			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1288	Please notify Wilderness Watch of any further opportunities to comment on the future management direction of Olympic National Park. We look forward to receiving the Final GMP. If you would like to discuss any of our comments or concerns please don't hesitate to contact us at 406-542-2048.			
1289	190543		Enumclaw	WA
1290	Dear NPS:			
1291	Thank you for the opportunity to urge decision makers to preserve the unique			
1292	natural systems at Olympic National Park. I support plans to include Ozette			
1293	Lake and surrounding areas to the wilderness of ONP. I also support the			
1294	inclusion of Crescent Lake and other important watersheds linked to ONP.			
1295	Preservation and restoration, including reintroduction, of the wild species			
1296	of the Olympic Peninsula should be supported.			
1297				
1298	Please restrict and refrain from further development within the park.			
1299	Surrounding communities can provide and benefit from providing services,			
1300	while the ability to have a more wilderness experience within the park can			
1301	be maintained. Much of the value of ONP resides in its quality as			
1302	non-developed public land.			
1303				
1304	Thank you for your consideration,			
1305	190535	National Audubon Society	University Place	WA
1306	Dear NPS:			
1307	Thank you for the opportunity to once again urge NPS to make decisions based			
1308	on the natural systems it must protect for all time.			
1309				
1310	For many years I assisted an adjunct professor conduct ³ Ecology Workshops ²			
1311	on the Olympic Peninsula for the National Audubon Society. These were			
1312	college-credit, hands-on workshops in the diverse ecosystem niches in			
1313	Olympic National Park, and the two National Wildlife Refuges on the			
1314	Peninsula.			
1315	Our students were almost exclusively from east of the Mississippi River,			
1316	coming to the Olympics to learn about a natural area of such quality as to			
1317	be designated a ³ World Heritage. ² The unanimous reaction of our			
1318	participants -- teachers and serious natural-history students -- was one of			
1319	awe and reverence for the beauty, integrity, and importance of the carefully			
1320	protected niches they saw.			
1321				
1322	I strongly urge you to help keep Olympic National Park's integrity as a			
1323	world-class natural area.			
1324				
1325	Recognizing that the outer coast portion of the park has some of the world's			
1326	(1) highest-diversity tide pools, (2) easily accessed viewing areas for			
1327	coastal marine bird populations and marine mammals (including sea otters), I			
1328	commend you for preserving this outer coast strip. Please recommend adding			
1329	Ozette Lake, and a secure buffer of the lake, to this important part of the			
1330	wilderness of ONP.			
1331				
1332	And included in that consideration, I urge you to keep all developed areas			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1333	in the park as they are now -- a recommendation of Alternative A. Please NO			
1334	NEW developed areas. Plan for new services, attractions, campgrounds,			
1335	whatever -- to please be OUTSIDE the park boundary.			
1336				
1337	As usage increases in ONP, and as development of lands near the park			
1338	continues to spiral upward, wider buffers of the unique ecosystems need to			
1339	be in place. Please do plan to extend the park's boundaries around Ozette			
1340	Lake, and also at Lake Crescent and the wonderful rivers that drain the			
1341	snows of the Olympics to the Pacific Ocean. Much of this extension to the			
1342	park (included in your alternative B) would protect salmon and other			
1343	wildlife important to the diversity of ONP -- and fast disappearing from			
1344	inhabited areas. Plan to re-introduce animals, the wolves and fishers, that			
1345	once were there.			
1346				
1347	I learned from the participants of our Audubon Ecology Workshops that			
1348	Olympic National Park is very important to humanity's heritage of completely			
1349	un-manipulated nature.			
1350				
1351	Thank you for this opportunity to vehemently speak for preservation of our			
1352	World Heritage Site.			
1353				
1354	190513		None Provided	N/A
1355	The Olympics are not only beautiful, but also a critical ecological benefit to the Pacific Northwest. Please protect them by preventing any new development within the protected area.			
1356				
1357	From a concerned student at the University of Washington,			
1358	190544		None Provided	N/A
1359	Through 30 years or so of hiking, I have enjoyed much of the backcountry of Olympic National Park. I DO NOT want to see more development in the interior of the Park, where ancient groves of trees, deep valleys, high rugged mountains and beautiful meadows still exist as they did before the white man arrived on these shores. This area is a treasure that should be saved, explored and savored by future generations of Americans and other people who are attracted to the beauty of the place.			
1360				
1361	Count my vote towards preserving the beauty and keeping the development as low impact as possible (campgrounds, small visitor centers, hiking trails).			
1362				
1363	190813		Port Angeles	WA
1364	My family and friends have been enjoying Lake Ozette for the last 30+ years, including Rayonier Landing, Swan Bay and many other spots around the Lake. At this time, we are leasing some property near the Lake and go out at least once or twice a month. We need to be able to use motorized boats as transportation around the lake. It is a huge lake and most people are not capable of rowing to their cabins and other destinations on the lake.			
1365	The wind can come up very suddenly on Lake Ozette, making it very dangerous for canoes, kayaks etc.			
1366				
1367	Please don't let the Park change anything at Lake Ozette, just leave it the way it is and let people enjoy it for as long as possible as it is one of the few places we can go and enjoy some peace and quiet most of the year.			
1368				
1369	I support Alternative A. Swan Bay and Rayonier Landing are currently being used by a minimum of people that are friends of Lake Ozette that respect its beauty. Without this access we would not be able to enjoy the beauty of the area. Not every person is able to hike to spots in the Olympic National Park. Our tax dollars should provide a Park that EVERY person can access. These lake side recreation sites are easily accessible for most people.			
1370				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1371	190929		Port Angeles	WA
1372	My family and friends have been enjoying Lake Ozette for the last 30+ years, including Rayonier Landing, Swan Bay and many other spots around the lake. At this time, we are leasing some property near the Lake and go out at least once or twice a month. We need to be able to use motorized boats as transportation around the lake. It is a huge lake and most people are not capable of rowing to their cabins and other destinations on the lake. The wind can come up very suddenly on Lake Ozette, making it very dangerous for canoes kayaks, etc.			
1373	Please don't let the Park change anything at Lake Ozette, just leave it the way it is an dlet people enjoy it for as long as possible as it is one of the few places we can go and enjoy some peace and quiet most of the year.			
1374				
1375	I support Alternative A. Swan Bay and Rayonier Landing are currently being used by a minimum of people that are friends of Lake Ozette that respect its beauty. Without this access we would not be able to enjoy the beauty of the area. Not every person is able to hike to spots in the Olympic National Park. Our tax dollars should provide a Park the EVERY person can access. These lake side recreation sites are easily accessible for most people.			
1376				
1377	190966		Olympia	WA
1378	Most government agencies that manage our wild areas have a somewhat tarnished reputation as stewards; in part, due to what are widely considered bad management decisions influenced by politics. Many predators such as wolves and bears were heavily persecuted in the late 1800s, early 1900s because of a negative perception. Current views have efforts focused on reintroducing these species back into their historic ranges. Many nonnative plant species were introduced into our parks and national forests with good intentions that went wildly out of control as these plants outcompeted native species. Efforts are now focused on exterminating or reducing these nonnatives such as Scot's broom and knotweed.			
1379				
1380	Here is the opportunity to refocus efforts to the original intent when these agencies were created and that is the stewardship of our native lands and animals. We know that biological systems are more successful when managed as systems instead of targeted specific species or ecosystems. People are attracted to these areas because of the wilderness' uniqueness and such interest should be encouraged. However, allowing this interest to govern management decisions is leading back to bad management decisions. The current proposed General Management Plan is a step in the right decision, but needs to shift more weight back to "management" of the national park. Alternative B is the preferred alternative if the intent of the Park Service is truly about preserving the ecological integrity of the Olympic National Park.			
1381				
1382	The amount of impact on the ecosystem needs to be at a minimum. The proposed development of both the Elwha and Sol Duc campgrounds are alarming. While expansion of the campgrounds may be required, limit the number of future sites to around 100 and not 250. Reduce the number of roads accessing the park, and reduce offroad vehicle use. More roads increases the distribution of invasive plants and animals, especially by offroad vehicles. Prioritize riparian areas and salmon recovery since these habitats are the most sensitive areas within the park. Limit the amount of commercial concessions within the park. Prioritize wilderness and decrease emphasis on historical structures. Such structures should be managed with passive neglect, allowing the wilderness to reclaim the habitat.			
1383				
1384	Education will go a long way towards understanding complex ecosystems, and the plan for expanding educational and interpretive programs is definitely a good management decision. Minimizing impact in heavily used areas through a mass transit system is also a good management decision and one that is increasing in many parks throughout the United States. Increasing the park boundaries is a positive step towards preserving our natural resources for future generations. Dwindling habitat is a major problem for many species, and increasing the amount of contiguous habitat may be the only refuge for many plant and animal species.			
1385				
1386	While I understand that Alternative D tries to offer a compromise between resource preservation and human use, I strongly encourage adopting Alternative B as the best choice for the Olympic National Park. Remember that the purpose of the National Park Service is preservation of our national resources.			
1387	190784		Port Angeles	WA
1388	I believe there should be no change to the Lake Ozette area in Olympic National Park. There is no reason to limit powered boats as there are not that many that use the lake, anyway. We would also like to keep the options of using camp areas other than the main one at the North end of the lake. There is not that much of a human impact in any area of the Lake.			
1389	This is a great place to enjoy and it should not be changed.			
1390	My preference is Alternative A.			
1391	190927		Port	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1392	My Great grandparents (the Nylunds) homesteaded at the North end of Lake Ozette in the 1890s and lived there and at Swan Bay until the mid 1930's. From the 1920's through the 1940's my father and his 5 brothers and sisters lived in the area from Lake Ozette through the Royal Valley. My Great Uncle (Alfred Nylund) was one of the first people to build and use internal combustion powered boats on the Lake until his death in the 1920's. Of course, he probably would not be here today, but I would be he would try to pass along his skill and knowledge to some of his descendants.		Angeles	
1393				
1394	Unfortunately, I didn't have a whole lot of knowledge of Lake Ozette until the early 1970's when my wife and I met Ranger Bill Lester. He gave us so much information that we still remember his help to this day.			
1395				
1396	To get to the point, my family has been enjoying the lake for the last 30+ years, including Rayonier Landing, Swan Bay and many other spots around the Lake. At this time, we are leasing some property near the Lake and go out at least once or twice a month. I am getting to the point that there is no way I, or a lot of my family, could get a lot of enjoyment out of the Lake if we had to paddle around there due to health problems, etc. If I can't use powered transportation around the Lake, I would not be able to use it at all and that would be a shame. I would also hate to see anyone forced to row down the lake to see it's beauty and then be caught in a big storm and try paddle back to aid and safety through very bad conditions; I've been there and seen how it can be and it can get very bad.			
1397				
1398	Please don't let the Park change anything at Lake Ozette, just leave it the way it is and let people enjoy it for as long as possible as it is one of the few places we can go and enjoy some peace and quiet most of the year.			
1399	191211		Quilcene	WA
1400	Letter on file			
1401	191199	Rayonier	Hoquiam	WA
1402	Letter on File			
1403	190931		None Provided	N/A
1404	I would urge park planners to adopt Olympic Park Associates recommendations for ONP's management plan.		Lynnwood	WA
1405	188646			
1406	It appears that the National Park Service is proposing a slew of new management plans for the Olympic National Park, including fuels management programs and increased development for visitors and tourism.			
1407	This is NOT advisable nor wise. Don't turn a natural resource into a zoo!			
1408	NF			
1409	189408		Seattle	WA
1410	I am writing as a member of a family that has enjoyed the Olympic			
1411	National Park area for 4 generations. We are deeply concerned about			
1412	protecting this incredible piece of nature and are responding to the			
1413	general management plan draft.			
1414				
1415	We thank you for establishing intertidal reserves on the Olympic Coast			
1416	and recommending wilderness study for Lake Ozette in the management plan			
1417	but have additional concerns.			
1418				
1419	We strongly support keeping developed areas and development zones at			
1420	their current size as described in Alternative A of the management plan.			
1421	We urge you to establish river protection zones to protect salmon			
1422	habitats and natural river processes as proposed in Alternative B. We			
1423	would like to see all 13 eligible rivers recommended for federal Wild			
1424	and Scenic river designation.			
1425				
1426	We support expanding park boundaries to protect critical habitats for			
1427	salmon and wildlife as proposed in Alternative B. And we request that			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1428	controversial decisions relating to Wilderness designation be deferred			
1429	until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed.			
1430	190846		Seattle	WA
1431	I am writing to endorse the response made by the Olympic Park Associates			
1432	to the Draft General Management Plan. This is a precious place and -			
1433	though we want people to be able to enjoy it, we can't afford to let it			
1434	be loved to death as so many wonderful places in this country have been.			
1435				
1436	190973		SEATTLE	WA
1437	PLEASE RESPOND WILL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF THIS COMMENT:			
1438				
1439	I think you should extend the comment period further. I read about it in Seattle Times August 20. Needed a lot more time!!! First, the Ballard library did not have a copy of DEIS, and when they called the main library, they did not know anything about it! It's a large study, and it takes time to go through it online, and to analyze it all. I have had almost no time. So can now only make a few general comments, unfortunately.			
1440				
1441	As a person who loves the Ozette area, and who camps there when possible, I certainly hope there will be very little change. Just maintain the current facilities. Try to preserve the lake from sedimentation. The Alava and the other ocean trails are fine (boardwalks), just maintain them so they are safe to walk on. Keep those camping areas at the ocean (Alava) as is. The natural experience should take precedent over any kind of "development". Don't put up a lot of signage.			
1442				
1443	I also love Lake Crescent Lodge area. Please don't add any more visitor information stuff. It is all terrific as is.			
1444				
1445	Maintain all trails, that's the main thing. Don't add any unnecessary buildings or facilities. Just be sure those that are there are maintained well.			
1446				
1447	I hope I will have a chance to comment further in the future. I feel it was very difficult to get all the necessary information for comment, in so short a time. I plan to contact government officials regarding this problem. It has been frustrating.			
1448				
1449				
1450	191177		Seattle	WA
1451	Here is one more specific comment from me (I no longer have access today to Internet and email, to continue my earlier comment) (which I emailed to you earlier today).			
1452				
1453	Please do not relocate the charming lakeside campground at Ozette, as was recommended by your alternatives B, C, and D. (Stick with Alternative A on this issue). That is the most heavenly place to camp. It would be terrible to take away that perfect experience. A slight expansion might be o.k. Or (better) adda nother campsite nearby.			
1454	190828		Sequim	WA
1455	I live and work in Sequim and when I have some time off, my family and relatives like to go hiking in the park. One of our favorite hikes is to the Olypic Hotsprings. I have only found hotsprings like these over in Idaho where I lived for over 21 years.			
1456				
1457	Please do not take away the soaking pools. I was told that people leave more trash here, but then again, there are also more people in this spot than many other spots in the park. Just because some people cause trouble is not a good reason to shut it down for the many people who don't.			
1458				
1459	Thank you for listening to our comments.			
1460				
1461	190949	Interfor Pacific Inc	Bellingham	WA
1462	Letter on File			
1463	190734		Forks	WA
1464	What more will be lost if the Olympic National Park (ONP) adopts alternative Plan B or preferred D??			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1465				
1466	Since the creation of the ONP in 1938 (mostly from USDA Forest Service lands) the following has occurred.			
1467				
1468	Gone; over 90% of the structures the ONP inherited...ranger stations, guard stations, cabins, lookouts, and others.			
1469				
1470	Abandoned; approximately 100 miles of trail (just on the west side)			
1471				
1472	Gone; 80% of privately owned and property taxed resorts (including the Olympic Hot Springs). Today there are four resorts in operation, and Hurricane Ridge Lodge...all owned by ONP at the public expense.			
1473				
1474	Severely Crippled; family fishin on Lake Mills and Lake Crescent (due to discontinued fishery programs with the State of Washington, followed by restrictions unfavorable to most Park users).			
1475				
1476	No Longer Managed: highland lakes for fishing recreation.			
1477				
1478	Basically Gone; goat watching at Lake Crescent's Storm King and other locations in the Park (such as the Mount Angeles area).			
1479				
1480	Eliminated; camping along the Queets corridor.			
1481				
1482	Gone; at least 8 Horse Rental and Guide Service Stations that were on major drainages at or near the end of roads in the Park.			
1483				
1484	Space below for losses not covered above.			
1485				
1486	I recommend the ONP administration choose the Visitor Opportunities Emphasis, Alternative C. It's the only one that appropriately addresses the three reason "why" the Olympic National Park was formed in '38.			
1487	191019	The Wilderness Society	Seattle	WA
1488	Thank you for the opportunity for The Wilderness Society to comment on the Draft General Management Plan (GMP) and Environmental Impact Statement for Olympic National Park.			
1489				
1490	The Wilderness Society is a national conservation organization that works to protect America's wilderness and wildlife and to develop a nationwide network of wild lands. Our goal is to ensure that future generations will enjoy the clean air and water, wildlife, beauty and opportunities for recreation and renewal that pristine forests, rivers, deserts, and mountains provide. These comments are submitted on behalf of The Wilderness Society's 200,000 members. Our organization has worked to protect the public lands in Olympic National Park since 1935 when The Wilderness Society was founded.			
1491				
1492	Olympic National Park was established because it is truly a spectacular place with ancient forests, cascading mountain streams, essential habitat for wildlife and fish populations, and incredible scenery and vistas. From its coastal strip on the Pacific Ocean, to high alpine meadows and glaciers, Olympic National Park is a special place for many Americans. The U.S. Congress has recognized these significant values and passed legislation in 1988 which was signed into law by President Reagan designating much of the Park into the National Wilderness Preservation System.			
1493				
1494	Wilderness			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1495	The Wilderness Society is concerned that the General Management Plan (GMP) and Olympic National Park personnel are not adequately providing for wilderness protection in the park. There is no wilderness management plan in place despite the fact that the wilderness designation covers most of the National Park and it was designated in 1988, about 18 years ago. On page 26, the GMP states that park staff will develop a wilderness management plan, but on pages 37-39 where there is a discussion of planning efforts and planning documents there is no mention of developing a wilderness management plan. We believe such a wilderness management plan is an essential tool for Park managers, and can provide direction for how best to protect the Park's wilderness, while meeting other land management needs. We urge you to develop detailed plan, with a time table and to make a serious effort for completing a wilderness management plan as soon as possible. The plan and timetable should be clearly discussed and displayed in the final General Management Plan.			
1496				
1497	Wild and Scenic Rivers			
1498	The GMP provides an opportunity to recommend rivers for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic River system thereby providing additional protection for the values these rivers provide. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires federal agencies to study rivers for eligibility in their planning efforts. NPS management policies also require this. The U.S. Forest Service has determined many of the rivers that flow through the Park to be eligible as a result of its own studies, including the Duckabush, Dosewallips, Gray Wolf, Elwha, Sol Duc, Bogachiel, Hoh, Quinault and South Fork Skokomish rivers. However, since the major portion of some of these rivers lies within Olympic National Park, such as the Hoh, Quinault, Bogachiel and Elwha, the Forest Service has not performed any further analysis, and is deferring to the Park Service for any recommendation to Congress to include these rivers in the national system. We urge you to review the eligibility of these rivers and to make recommendations for including these rivers into the Wild and Scenic River system.			
1499				
1500	The General Management Plan is an important document and will set the direction for how the Olympic National Park is managed for many years. We urge you to recognize the importance of the wilderness values and protection needs of this land, as you develop your final plan.			
1501				
1502	Please contact me if you would like additional information regarding these comments. Thanks for the opportunity to participate in the planning process.			
1503	190120		Shoreline	WA
1504	Alternative B,C & D all describe the visitor constructed hot springs pools at the Olympic Hot Springs site to be removed, and the area would be restored to a natural state. Who has determined what the natural state of that area is ? Prior to development of the area and the construction of the dam I imagine the area was only used by local people and Native Americans. Do you know they did not have any pools created there for their own use ? History should be a top priority and the CCC campgrounds should not be removed.			
1505	I like parts of the options A,C & D and have reservations of parts of all also.			
1506	Option A is the best you seem to have.			
1507	It would be nice if an option E could be drafted including obviously, #1 in all the plans since that is a constant. In Alt A, #4. with the exhibits or waysides added. In Alt C, #3, In Alt D, #2. That would be my ideal plan.			
1508	191258		Port Angeles	WA
1509	Letter on File			
1510	190955	Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary	Port Angeles	WA
1511	We appreciate this opportunity to provide comments on Olympic National Park's (ONP)			
1512	Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DGMP/EIS). The			
1513	Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) is one of fourteen marine protected			
1514	areas managed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National			
1515	Marine Sanctuary Program. While there are differences in our enabling legislation and in			
1516	our programs, the similarities are more relevant to our comments.			
1517				
1518	The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary was designated, under the authority of the			
1519	National Marine Sanctuary Act, in 1994. The designation document states the purpose of			
1520	designation as protecting and managing the conservation, recreational, ecological,			
1521	historical, research, educational, and aesthetic resources and qualities of the Olympic			
1522	Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Olympic National Park was very involved in the			
1523	designation process of the sanctuary, and since that time our two sites have enjoyed a			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1524	very positive relationship. Olympic National Park participates on our Advisory Council,			
1525	providing OCNMS with advice on management issues. This Advisory Council includes			
1526	a broad representation from federal, state, local, tribal governments and constituent			
1527	groups. Other areas of collaboration have included OCNMS support for coastal			
1528	interpreters, shared training opportunities for resource protection and interpretive staff,			
1529	cooperative efforts for oil spill response planning, OCNMS support for marine debris			
1530	removal, interpretive facilities planning, and intertidal monitoring. There have been			
1531	several other areas of collaboration that have been discussed, but not implemented due to			
1532	limited resources. As the Park moves forward to implant their General Management			
1533	Plan, we hope to continue and enhance this partnership.			
1534				
1535	There are a number of areas in the DGMP/EIS, where additional references to the marine			
1536	areas adjacent to ONP may be mentioned. For instance the "Regional Context" of the			
1537	document references the management of adjacent terrestrial areas, but does not mention			
1538	the management of adjacent marine areas. There are a number of "Parkwide Policies and			
1539	Desired Conditions" (including associated strategies) that could also be expanded to			
1540	explicitly include marine areas. For instance the "Natural Soundscapes" section could			
1541	include, supporting OCNMS's overflight restrictions as a strategy. Additional policies			
1542	that could be expanded to be more specific to the park's coastal strip and adjacent marine			
1543	areas include; ecosystem management, water resources, native species, and exotic			
1544	species.			
1545				
1546	In general terms, in the areas of direct interest to OCNMS, we support the preferred			
1547	alternatives, in particular those dealing with the intertidal areas of Olympic National			
1548	Park. OCNMS and ONP have shared management responsibility for the intertidal area of			
1549	the park's coastal strip, specifically the sanctuary's boundary extends shoreward to the			
1550	mean higher high water line where adjacent to federal lands, and the park's boundary			
1551	extends to mean lower low water on the coastal strip. Since the sanctuary's designation			
1552	this overlapping, or intertidal, area has been the subject of much discussion.			
1553				
1554	In response to concerns shared by ONP and OCNMS managers, a Marine Conservation			
1555	Working Group (MCWG) was established by the OCNMS Advisory Council in early			
1556	2000 to evaluate the issue of marine zoning as a management tool, to make specific			
1557	recommendations on the status and effectiveness of existing zoning, and to develop an			
1558	intertidal zoning strategy. The study area was federally owned intertidal shoreline where			
1559	OCNMS and ONP share jurisdiction, tribal reservation areas or State lands were not			
1560	included. Representatives from 14 groups, including tribal, federal, state and county			
1561	governments, and the commercial fishing, conservation and scientific communities, were			
1562	invited to participate in the MCWG. Sixteen meetings were held between April 2000 and			
1563	October 2003. Various representatives attended meetings and contributed at differing			
1564	levels throughout the process. Over the course of three years, this working group listened			
1565	to regional experts on oceanography, nearshore and intertidal ecology, and resource			
1566	management, reviewed information on visitation and use of the marine shores, studied			
1567	findings of human impacts at other shorelines from the U.S. and throughout the world,			
1568	and reviewed a range of management measures implemented to control and minimize			
1569	human impacts on intertidal natural resources and habitats. The recommendations			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1570	developed by the MCWG agree well with the park's preferred alternative. We believe			
1571	these recommendations are well founded and are the basis of wise and appropriate			
1572	management for these marine shores. We recommend Olympic National Park keep the			
1573	intertidal reserve zones in the final general management plan.			
1574				
1575	Language associated with the use of intertidal reserves and intertidal reserve zones should			
1576	be consistent with other use of "zone" and should be edited to reduce confusion and			
1577	misinterpretation, for example:			
1578	Table 1, p. 57 to avoid confusion, there should be consistent use of the term			
1579	"intertidal area" where appropriate and exclusive use of the term "zone" in the			
1580	phrase "intertidal reserve zones". Part of the confusion results from common use			
1581	of the phrase "intertidal zone" by ecologists/biologists. In the DGMP/EIS, the			
1582	intertidal reserve zone is a zone type with several areas of designation. However,			
1583	a casual review of Table 1 might lead a reader to think this zone type is			
1584	recommended for all intertidal areas in the park. In the "Zone Concept" row, a			
1585	suggested edit is "The park's intertidal area reserve zone &is an ecologically			
1586	critical area that sustains diverse assemblages& Selected coastal and intertidal			
1587	areas within the park would be designated as intertidal reserves zones to protect			
1588	these highly diverse communities in these zones."			
1589				
1590	The Olympic National Park may also want to consider including management options for			
1591	the intertidal areas surrounding the islands of the Washington Islands National Wildlife			
1592	Refuge. While the upland areas are under the jurisdiction of the Washington Islands			
1593	National Wildlife Refuge, it is our understanding that the park's jurisdiction includes the			
1594	intertidal areas of these islands. While mentioned in Appendix C, the DGMP/EIS does			
1595	not appear to include any management options for the offshore islands. Human access to			
1596	refuge portions these islands is prohibited in recognition of their unique values to			
1597	seabirds and marine mammals. However, the refuge's no-access buffer around the			
1598	islands is a recommendation, not a regulation.			
1599				
1600	It is our understanding that under current			
1601	park management, the intertidal portions of the islands have management consistent with			
1602	the mainland shore. Visitors could land on in intertidal area; this appears to be a loophole			
1603	that the park may consider reviewing in consultation with the Refuge Manager.			
1604	190815		Quilcene	WA
1605	As 30-year residents of the Olympic Peninsula, we would like to urge you to protect our Olympic National Park by following these guidelines:			
1606				
1607	1. Establish river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural			
1608	river processes are preserved, as proposed in Alternative B.			
1609				
1610	2. Recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic river designation.			
1611				
1612	3. Recommend restoration of extirpated species like the wolf and fisher.			
1613				
1614	4. Limit development zones inside park boundaries to current uses. New commercial developments, campgrounds and RV parks should be located outside the park.			
1615				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1616	5. Defer decisions relating to designated Wilderness until a comprehensive			
1617	wilderness management plan is completed.			
1618				
1619	As population and recreational demand on the park increase,			
1620	and land use patterns change around the park, managers must be diligent			
1621	in protecting Olympic's outstanding natural qualities.			
1622				
1623	Please do not follow the pattern of other national parks by chipping away at the full wilderness environment that all of us have grown to love, respect, and determined to protect for future generations.			
1624				
1625	Thank you very much for your consideration.			
1626				
1627	190723			
1628	To Whom It May Concern:			
1629				
1630	I'm writing to you today about the issues of Lake Ozette and motorized vehicles. My family and I are well known by the Park's staff members, we are the Gaydeski Family.			
1631				
1632	My family has been going to Lake Ozette EVERY single year since the mid 1960's. We usually camp at Erickson's Bay with a wide variety of family members including, moms, dads, uncles, aunts, cousins, siblings, grandparents, and young infants. Our family started this tradition when my grandparents started their own little family. At first they would load everyone and all of their camping gear into one motorized boat and skim across the lake to the bay. Now as our families have grown, we end up taking about four boats. Many years ago, we also took our two jet skis, but a few years back the rules were passed and we are no longer able to bring them.			
1633				
1634	My family stays over at Erickson's Bay for five days. The tradition is that we leave as a group from our homes early Wednesday morning and don't come back home until Sunday afternoon. During our stay we set-up our tents, lay an dplay on the beach, eat, water ski and just enjoy each other' s company. Throughout our stay we hardly see motorized vehicles and only a few canoes. As we are packing up to leave on Sunday, my family always makes sure that we have left the campsites as good if not better than when we arrive.			
1635				
1636	You see, since we have all ages of people traveling with us ans there aren't any back roads to drive our vehicles to get to Erickson's Bay, if you stopped allowing motorized vehicles to be on the lake, my family probably would have to end this 50+ year tradition. This is very sad for my family and me. So many memories and so much bonding comes out during our stay at Lake Ozette. I always figured in a few years, my generation would carry on the tradition and bring our children to this wonderful and peaceful area. Lake Ozette isn't just a place to vacation, its part of our family and most of my memories have started at this large lake.			
1637				
1638	In 2000, during our annual stay at Erickson's Bay, we were enjoying our afternoon on the beach, when a man in his canoe came to shore in a hurry. HE was scrambling around packing up all of his and his wives items. My father went and asked him what was going on and where was his wife that we saw leaving with him earlier that morning. He told my father that she was very sick and he needed to get her to the Ranger's station. Being helpful, my parents and younger sister said they would help him. They asked where his wife was left and the man could not remember. My father having a motorized boat tried pulling the man in his canoe. This didn't work so my father loaded the canoe into the boat and began to search and rescue mission. After searching for the wife's canoe on the entire shoreline with no luck, my family and the man drove to the Ranger Station. Once they arrived to the Ranger Station the man spotted his wife. At this time it was pretty dark out and they were glad she made it there all by herself.			
1639				
1640	The point to my story is that many people could have been in a similar situation and without a motorized vehicle, that man wouldn't have made it around the entire lake and back to the Ranger Station before dark. We have also had some injuries, such as cuts, bee stinds, and other emergencies where if we couldn't use a motorized vehicle, we wouldn't have made it to the hospital in time.			
1641				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1642	I believe it is very important to allow motorize boats on Lake Ozette for many reasons. The two main reasons are for safety purposes and to keep a 50+ year tradition alive for another generation or two. Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions. I hope that we can keep the Gaydeski Family Traditions alive for the next generations to come.			
1643	188639		Woodinville	WA
1644	The Elwha area of the Olympic Peninsula contains extraordinary natural beauty. The hot springs provide an unobstrusive respite within this beautiful area that complement and enhance the forest experience. They are a much-beloved destination for myself and thousands of Puget Sound area residents. As a strong conservationist I see no reason to remove the hot springs pools for they pose no threat to the beauty or sanctity of the natural forest environment. The spiritual and physical healing properties of these hot springs situated within a forest environment are well known.			
1645	188553		Bellevue	WA
1646	I believe Olympic National Park should be developed more for visitors and tourists. It's such a huge park and there's so much to see yet so inaccessible.			
1647	190947	NORTH OLYMPIC CHAPTER OF THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS	None Provided	N/A
1648	The mission of the Society of American Foresters is to advance the science, education, technology, and practice of forestry; to enhance the competency of its members; to establish professional excellence; and, to use the knowledge, skills, and conservation ethic of the profession to ensure the continued health and use of forest ecosystems and the present and future availability of forest resources to benefit society.			
1649				
1650	The SAF North Olympic Chapter opposes the proposed boundary expansions and the purchase and exchange of 44,000 acres of forestland. Following are some of the mission conflicts that we expect under ONP management:			
1651				
1652	As new in holders, private forest landowners will be strongly compelled to become "willing sellers."			
1653				
1654	The Wilderness mandate of the ONP will disallow the timber harvest that is important to the continued health and use of the forest ecosystem. We view sustainable timber harvest as an ecosystem use that will be limited or eliminated.			
1655				
1656	The Wilderness mandate of the ONP will eliminate the active fish and wildlife habitat and water quality activities that are now and will continue to be done under the State of Washington Legislation. The ONP preservation ethic conflicts with the SAF conservation ethic and restricts our ability to ensure the continued health and use of the forest ecosystem.			
1657				
1658	Use of these lands will effectively be restricted to a very narrow class of people for non-consumptive activities. This conflicts with the present and future availability'to everyone'of forest resources.			
1659				
1660	Most of the Olympic Peninsula is already in federal ownership and is managed only for ecological services.			
1661				
1662	Our communities and families are very dependent on the sustainable and active timber harvest from the land that the ONP will eventually purchase.			
1663	188656		North Bend	WA
1664	I don't believe National Parks should be opened up for more development. In fact, they need to be preserved in their natural state as much as possible. I believe that any alternative which helps protect the wilderness character of Olympic National Park is the preferable alternative.			
1665	Thank you.			
1666	190838		Forks	WA
1667	After many days of reading and careful though I have come to the conclusion that Alternative A is the best choice. Alternative B should not even be considered due to its anti-visitor theme. Alternatives C and D would be nice if we had lots of extra money laying around to implement them but with the financial condition in this country most of the improvements would never be funded. The only thing that would be implemented is the taking of more land as there is plenty of money for land aquisition in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. You can't take care of the land you already have and should not take any more.			
1668				
1669	The Olympic National Park has over 900,000 acres most of which is in wilderness. That should be enough to protect anything needing protection. Don't be greedy unless your object is to take over the whole peninsula and kick us all out. In years past the Park Service did things that should not have been done to acquire land and most of us have not forgotten.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/Provin
2	Correspondence			
1670	<p>All the National Parks are for everyone not just the few who can backpack into the wilderenss. There has to be a balance so everyone can enjoy our parks even those physically challenged. Lake Ozette should not be changed.</p> <p>On another note I find it odd that you can adjust the wilderness boundary for things you want to do but you won't adjust the wilderness boundary so the Quileutes could move their school out of the tsunami zone. It seems to me that this woudl be more important that moving Kalaloch Lodge.</p> <p>Is also would help to have some definitions of terms in the front of the document, especially the definition of Wilderness Values.</p> <p>I realize that this is a wish list and that sometime there may be funding for some of the things you want to do but the reality of that happening is very remote. With all the problems that confront the world now it's highly unlikely to have the funding do anything more than grab more land. I appreciate all the hard work that went into the document but for the foreseeable future you should stick with Plan A.</p> <p>The controversy over the maintaining the historical trail shelters and the controlled burn at Lake Ozette is evidence that adding more wilderness is counterproductive. Adding wilderness area to the park diminishes the historical areas and public access while merely increasing the size of the park.</p>			
1671				
1672				
1673				
1674				
1675				
1676				
1677				
1678				
1679				
1680	189419		Snohomish	WA
1681	My wife and I are writing to provide our comments on your proposed Olympic National Park General Management Plan.			
1682	First, let us compliment the National Park Service for attempting to establish intertidal reserves on the Olympic Coast, and for recommending a wilderness study for Lake Ozette.			
1683				
1684				
1685	Second, we request that development zones and developed areas be maintained at their current sizes described in Alternative A.			
1686				
1687	Third, we strongly urge the Park Service to:			
1688	-recommend restoration of species that have been lost to the Park,			
1689	such as the wolves and fishers;			
1690	-establish river protection zones to make sure that critical natural river			
1691	processes and salmon habitats be preserved as proposed in			
1692	Alternative B;			
1693	-recommend that all 13 eligible rivers be given federal Wild and Scenic			
1694	river designation; and			
1695	-expand the Park's boundaries in the five areas of Lake Ozette, Lake			
1696	Crescent, and the Hoh, Queets and Quinault watersheds to protect			
1697	critical salmon and other wildlife habitats, as proposed in Alternative B.			
1698				
1699	Finally, we request that any controversial decisions relating to designated Wilderness be deferred until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed.			
1700	189425		Port Angeles	WA
1701	Here are my comments, from the Open house at Sequim WA. The notes are			
1702	in the order that I went from station to station. Not in any rank			
1703	order.			
1704				
1705	Area of ONP:			
1706				
1707	Dosewallips: Best is Alt "C" for the reason of keeping the campground			
1708	and low land trails open as long as you can since the Fall and Spring,			
1709	before the Park starts it summer season, are often a prime time to			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1710	visit this area.			
1711				
1712	Quinault: Once more, Alt. "C" not only for off season visits, but to			
1713	pave the Quinault lake Loop road; this is a very nice bike ride. While			
1714	I would like the road paved, the road does have to be a major highway!			
1715	Just give it a hard surface, even a heavy form of "Chip Seal" would do			
1716	very nicely. This area seldom is closed in the winter unless some part			
1717	of the road washes out, thus the need to fix several stream crossings			
1718	and the main river along the South side of the loop.			
1719				
1720	Kaloloch: Try to protect the lodge where it is, rather than moving it			
1721	across the road. The view from the buildings is the draw. I would			
1722	like to see the Park try some form of a "green' bank control first			
1723	along the Creek to prevent the Creek undermining the lodge and cabin			
1724	area. I would also like the road.Highway 101 improved for bikes. A			
1725	prime visitor benefit that is seldom in any of your information, is			
1726	the Bus route from Port Angeles and Forks along this road to Grays			
1727	Harbor area. So not all visitors have to come by personal car. The			
1728	use of the Bus would allow Bike riders to get into the Kaloloch Area			
1729	without using all of Highway 101. A crossing of the Hoh River would			
1730	allow much more of the Beach to be hiked in a single trip. In fact it			
1731	may be a way for the Hoh Tribe to earn some money. Yes some type of			
1732	Hoh seasonal Transit would be a help, see the note about Public Transit			
1733	around this park.			
1734				
1735	Deer Park: I support Alt "C" with an improvement of the Trail			
1736	Connections to Hurricane Ridge Road and down to the lakes and Dungeness			
1737	River areas and trail heads. Once more the road could be hard surfaced			
1738	with a heavy form of "Chip Seal" but not a super highway like the main			
1739	road to Hurricane Ridge up from Port Angeles. While I do not expect			
1740	the road to be plowed for winter use, some form of winter shelter at			
1741	the top would allow a safe spot if the weather changes for the cross			
1742	country skiers and snowshoers who do now use the road in the winter.			
1743	Mountain Bikers also use the road when it is "closed" in the off			
1744	seasons.			
1745				
1746	Hurricane Ridge: Leave it as it is now, no major changes. However			
1747	both the Little River Trail and the Old Road down to the Elwha could			
1748	use upgrading. The road out to obstruction Point could be upgraded a			
1749	little, that chipseal type that I have talked about for other roads in			
1750	the Park.			
1751				
1752	Sol Duc. Leave it as it is now. Keep the road open as much as you can			
1753	in the winter, while plowing it right after a storm is not needed, plow			
1754	and remove down trees as soon as you can. Campgrounds are fine now,			
1755	West side trail could use some improvements however.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1756				
1757	Lake Crescent: The East Beach Road will need some improvements as it			
1758	will be used by bikers to get to the new extended Spruce Railroad Trail			
1759	going to the top of Fairhome hill. As soon as you can open the			
1760	Tunnels, using a lining if you have too. Some branch trail down to			
1761	Fairhome Campground from the extended trail would allow riders to get			
1762	to the Campground from the trail. As it is now, a short, very steep			
1763	dirt construction road connects the Trail with Camp David which is some			
1764	distance from the campground, a detour which most likely will result in			
1765	visitors bypassing the campground and camping someplace along the tail,			
1766	not in an approved camping area.			
1767				
1768	Elwha Area: I support Alt "C" however the taking apart of the informal			
1769	hot spring pools only will result in there being rebuilt once more			
1770	unless you put full time staff in the area year around! unless you can			
1771	do something to improve the pools, adding pea gravel to reduce the mud			
1772	in the area, do nothing. The "road" does need some maintenance to have			
1773	it used as a bike and hiking trail to reach the improved campground.			
1774	This is one of the few areas where bikes can be on a "Trail". When the			
1775	Dams are removed, several public viewing areas and access trails will			
1776	need to be developed or opened up or people will make many new ways to			
1777	get in to see what is going on, how the river is clearing out the			
1778	deltas at the head of both lake areas. A trail down from the new			
1779	Adventure Route Trail to the West Side of Lake Aldwell to a viewing			
1780	site might be a possibility.			
1781				
1782	In the Backcountry, "Wilderness Areas" keep supporting safety shelters			
1783	at a days walk in from the trail head and beyond in areas like Low			
1784	Divide, High Divide, Dosewallips for example where visitors may well be			
1785	in for several days and have the weather change or shelter an injured			
1786	hiker until help can get to them. While the Back areas plan is next,			
1787	this support of back country shelters is very important to me so I am			
1788	giving my support for them now.			
1789				
1790	In all the low country areas, the roads and part of the campgrounds			
1791	need to be kept open until closed by snow or storm damage. They need			
1792	to be open in the early Spring as soon as you can do it, March or			
1793	early April, while this is not your normal "Seasonal" period, it is			
1794	what we local and visitors do to try to use them in this off season, so			
1795	pleas keep them open.			
1796				
1797	Thank You for your attention to this matter.			
1798	189420		Sheboygan	WI
1799	I would like to submit the following comments on the proposed General			
1800	Management Plan:			
1801				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1802	1. Please keep developed areas and development zones at their current size			
1803	(as in Alternative A). New recreational developments should be outside the			
1804	park boundaries.			
1805				
1806	2. Please expand park boundaries in Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, Hoh,			
1807	Queets, and Quinault areas (as in Alternative B).			
1808				
1809	3. Please establish river protection zones (as in Alternative B).			
1810				
1811	4. Please recommend all 13 rivers for Wild and Scenic River designation.			
1812				
1813	5. Please recommend restoration for extirpated species, such as the wolf			
1814	and fisher.			
1815				
1816	6. Please defer Wilderness designations until a comprehensive wilderness			
1817	management plan has been completed.			
1818				
1819	Thank you for the opportunity to make comments.			
1820	190834		Port	WA
1821	Letter on File		Angeles	
1822	191220		Seattle	WA
1823	Letter on File			
1824	190739	North Cascades	Seattle	WA
	A primary goal of the North Cascades Conservation Council (NCCC) is to focus on the management of the two national parks in the North Cascades of Washington (Mt. Rainier and North Cascades complex). With that experienced perspective, the NCCC welcomes this opportunity to comment on teh Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact	Conservation Council		
1825	Statement (May 2006) for Olympic National Park (ONP).			
1826				
	Olympic National Park is classified as a "wilderness park". Hence, wilderness management should be given preference over recreation management, throught ONP. Consequently, NCCC disagrees with the drafting of a General Managemetn PLan (DGMP) for ONP prior to developing a Draft Wilderness Management Plan (DWMP). Therefore the present DGMP shoulda cknowledge all instances where the future DWMP may have an impact on the DGMP and state that the DGMP would be adjusted to comply with the DWMP.			
1827				
1828				
1829	Consistent with NCCC's highest priority wilderness preservation recommendations, the NCCC further recommends "Resource Protection Emphasis Alternative B" for each of the 14 areas described in the DGMP. Specifically, the NCCC strongly urges the National Park Service's:			
1830				
1831	1. Preservation of nearly complete ecosystems, intact critical wildlife and salmon habitats, old-growth forests, and the incomparable scenic vistas. Fish stocking should not be permitted to impair the intact natural species preservation.			
1832				
1833	2. Restoration of threatened wildlife and disappearing species.			
1834				
1835	3. Establishment of intertidal reserves zones, in Alternative B, on the Lake Ozette and Mora sections of the Olympic Coast.			
1836				
1837	4. Establishment of river protection zones, in Alternatives B, for the Hoh, Queets, Quinault, and Quillayute Rivers.			
1838				
1839	5. Designate, as part of the Wild and Scenic River Act, those eligible potions of the Boagchiel, Ozette, Calawah, Queets, Dosewallips, Quinault, Duckabush, Elwa, Skokomish, Gray Wolf, Sol Duc, and Hoh Rivers and Royal Creek.			

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
1840		6. Expansion of the ONP boundaries, in Alternatives B, to protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife, to include the entire Lake Ozette watershed, and increased watersheds of Lake Crescent and the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault Rivers.			
1841					
1842					
1843		7. Development of new recreational facilities should occur outside the ONP boundaries.			
1844					
1845		8. Management of access to ONP by:			
1846					
1847		Monitoring and regulating stock use to minimize detrimental impacts in trails and prohibiting grazing within ONP.			
1848					
1849		Prohibit all mechanize use (bicycles and motor bikes) on trails on ONP to prevent degradation of, and competition with, peaceful pedestrian use.			
1850					
1851		Prohibit off road vehicle (ORV) use on any roadless area within ONP.			
1852					
1853		Regulate private vehicular use to prevent excessive congestion and substitute shuttle service alternatives.			
1854	190666	Of the proposals on the table, I prefer B in every case. However, I don't think even this proposal goes far enough. The Olympic wilderness is the last remaining native wilderness in the Northwest, and should remain as wilderness wherever possible, the park should expand its boundaries. No additional "developments" should be made. Existing developments should be removed and/or abandoned if the nearly extinct salmon are to have any hope of returning to their previous numbers. We must restore their habitat by removing all dams, allowing wild rivers to flow where they will, replanting the forest where it has been cut.		Seattle	WA
1855					
1856		Management of the Olympic peninsula should follow the lead of the traditional indigenous peoples who successfully lived here for over 12,000 years. One cannot help but notice the drastic difference between land outside the park and that within. Heartbreaking clearcuts vs. majestic cathedrals of trees.			
1857					
1858		I can't speak to the details of all these plans. Please consider a general policy of no development, restoration of wilderness of developed areas, reintroduction of species like the wolf and fisher, expansion of wilderness wherever possible, and any other strategies that will lead to more wild areas. Thank you for providing this forum for input.			
1859					
1860					
1861	190968	I endorse Olympic Park Associate's vision to maintain, and where possible, to restore the Olympic National Park wilderness ecosystem with its "original components and habitat functions intact." Towards that end, I strongly recommend uses that will protect park resources be encouraged while additional commercial concessions and development within the park be discouraged.	None	Port Townsend	WA
1862					
1863		Every time I enter the Park boundaries I give silent thanks to the generations of dedicated and visionary souls that contributed to its preservation (as described succinctly in Chapter 10 of Tim McNulty's "Natural History Guide to Olympic National Park"). With human population and development expanding exponentially, it is more important than ever that our generation protects and conveys this priceless legacy to our successors with its "original components and habitat functions intact" to the fullest extent possible.			
1864					
1865					
1866		Thank you for the opportunity to comment.			
1867	190505	We would like to express our strong preference for option D on the General Plan for Olympic National Park. We visit almost every year and enjoy the current state of the trails and facilities, and would like to continue sharing this beautiful park with our children. The current state is a well-implemented compromise between preserving wild areas and also giving carefully planned backcountry access. In addition, we believe that the backcountry shelters should be preserved, not only due to the unpredictable weather in Olympic National Park but also because of the historical value they represent. The original intention of the Park was that people should enjoy it, while respecting it, not that it should be closed off from public access, nor damaged through overuse. We have a deeply personal and family connection with the area, and would be upset if either of those things were to happen. For these reasons, we advocate Option D on the General Plan.		NA	N/A
1868					
1869		Thank you for allowing us to comment.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1870	190523		Brisbane	CA
1871	Comments on the Draft General Management Plan for Olympic National Park are as follows:			
1872	We think Alternative D "The Preferred Alternative" has been well thought out. It provides opportunity for the average visitor to experience the major eco-systems within the Park (seashore, rainforest and mountains) without unduly stressing those eco-systems and the environment. Additionally it provides for access to the mountains via a maintained trail system, and preservation of shelters and seasonal ranger stations and services for those wishing to pursue a more "close-up" experience. It allows for reasonable growth of current visitor facilities to accommodate a growing population and expected increase in visitors to the Park.			
1873				
1874				
1875	We know there are interests who would abolish all structures in the established Wilderness Area, but there are reasons to retain and maintain the trail system and historic structures, most of which were constructed while the U.S. Forest Service was responsible for the Olympic National Forest, and long before the Park and subsequent Wilderness Area were so designated. Some of these structures were built with the assistance of the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps), an historic project in itself. Others were built under the direction of Chris Morgenroth, an early district supervisor for the USFS and local pioneer. There are some structures (formerly residences/cabins of people important to local and Park history) within the area. These, too, should be considered historic resources and preserved. Trails should be maintained to acceptable safety levels; there should be shelters in case of sudden weather changes and other emergencies. These buildings are an important part of the local history and should not be allowed to just rot away. Where they can be saved, they should be.			
1876				
1877	The Olympic National Park (along with all national parks) was created for the enjoyment of the people. We believe Alternative D of the Draft GMP carries on the intent of the original legislation.			
1878	188687	Wa State Resident 48 years	Kirkland	WA
1879	The Olympic Nat'l Park must be continued to be managed/preserved as a wild ecosystem for the enjoyment of the nation's tax paying citizens, NOT INCREASED DEVELOPMENT for visitors and tourism. Outdoor enthusiasts who wish to enjoy and respect the park for that purpose are welcome as "visitors and tourists". Stores, concrete, condos, apts, motels are not visitors. The Oly Nat'l Park is not a tax base, it's a Nat'l treasure that belongs to all of the United States. As a resident of the State of Wa for the last 48 years, our families and friends, all consider this sacred ground!			
1880	189437		None Provided	N/A
1881	Hello,			
1882				
1883	I would like to let you know that myself and family prefer Alternative B and/or D in the Draft GMP/EIS.			
1884				
1885	We hope our opinion is considered.			
1886	190503		Cross Plains	WI
1887	Dear People,			
1888				
1889	Please add my letter in support of any plan that preserves the present utilization of the hot springs in Olympic National Park for naturists enjoying the pools as close to your Plan A as is possible. Our family of two adults and 3 children have made major plans in our vacations to include enjoying the naturist experience within your national park and in particular, the hot springs pools, and we believe it would be a real loss of our quality of life experiences should the springs be closed down or similar efforts made to decrease the present utilization of this unique resource.			
1890	190963		POULSBO	WA
1891	The comments I am providing refer to the Chapter 2 zones and alternatives described in the EIS document. I will be making reference to an organization i belong to but i want to very clearly state that my commments to this document only express my personal opinion and in NO way indicate an official position statement by any organization or employer i may have connection with. In order to give credibility to the opinions i will offer i would like to give some personal background of myself. I have lived in Washington since 1978. Since 1979 I have been an active volunteer in Olympic Mountain Rescue (OMR), chartered in Bremerton Washington. I have participated in countless SAR missions in Olympic National Park (ONP) over these years. I have obviously traveled extensively within ONP on actual missions, training, and plain recreation trips with family and friends. I have co-authored the 4th edition of the Olympic Mountains climbers guidebook.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1892	I am a climber, hiker, skier, photographer and conservation supporter. I have volunteered annually at Hurricane Ridge for the Nordic ski patrol since its inception and for many years served as the OMR coordinator for the volunteer effort. While i am directing comment at this time to ONP i would like to state that i have found time over the years to climb, hike and ski in many of the National Parks from Coast to Coast, making my basis for opinion not just formulated from observations on the particular circumstances or ecosystem of ONP. I could likely ramble on more but i hope this introduction will give my comments legitimacy as they are reviewed as public input.			
1893	I generally support the Alternative D for all the described zones in the EIS. I have some specific comments for individual zones that i will voice in the following paragraphs.			
1894	HURRICANE RIDGE AND OBSTRUCTION POINT			
1895	The level of snow "grooming" that has occurred on the unplowed section of road from the ridge visitor center toward hurricane hill end of road has been an improvement for skier safety and user enjoyment in the past few years. Since this area has excellent potential for less experienced users to enjoy the winter backcountry make the travel easier and safe is acceptable in my mind. I am very much against any further level of "grooming" that would include setting ski tracks and skating lanes. One of my strongest pleas for the winter wilderness experience at ONP is to retain the true nordic BACKCOUNTRY ski experience as authentic as possible. I do not see manicured ski trails fitting the EIS guidelines of hurricane ridge. The lattes at the visitor center can be tolerated.			
1896	There was discussion about possible grooming on the Obstruction point road. I am against this idea for very strong safety concerns based on my years of touring and exploring the ridge in winter. The OP road in my opinion is more susceptible to wind drifting and more localized harsh weather effects that the novice winter traveler may not be well equipped to encounter. Now the start to this trail option presents difficulties that i feel is a filter to keep inexperienced skiers from even starting this trip before they can get miles out and over their heads in a blizzard. I feel it would be an inappropriate use of funds to safely maintain a groomed path and encourage less experienced people to attempt OP road. On the other had the Wolf Creek trail has for many years been under utilized as XC terrain, yet with some minor leveling "grooming" could be an excellent addition to split visitor volumes into a relatively safe travel area.			
1897	CRESCENT LAKE			
1898	Under Alt D i would like to see a little more property extension to buffer the summit and ridge line north of Pyramid peak. My western addition boundary line suggestion would be to take the proposed west line and continue it due south to intersect the existing ONP boundary on the ridge to ensure that some trees might be re-established on the north side of Pyramid and avoid hikers having to listen to rifle shots and off road vehicles just feet from the final portion of hike trial to the lookout.			
1899	SOL DUC			
1900	I would endorse year round hot spring use if economically feasible. Even keeping a portion of the campground open in the sholder seasons could be benefit to public. It has been a long time since i have taken advantage of the front country features of Sol Duc; camp and water springs which are very enjoyable but incredibly crowded in summer. Off season i would be tempted to return when less crowded.			
1901	DOSE			
1902	Some road reconstruction compromise must be reached to restore this excellent backcountry gateway. The Dose has always provided frontcountry and backcountry attractions to a balanced group of visitor abilitlies. I would think this year with both the Dose and Stair case roads closed that some of the other areas suffered from overuse, which cannot be a wise alternative.			
1903	DEER PARK			
1904	Some mention was made of paving the road. I think this would be very foolish use of tax dollars. Constructing a road for seasonal use is a waste of funds when other areas of park protection or maintenance likely need attention.			
1905	Thank you for considering the above comments i have voiced.			
1906	190684		Poulsbo	WA
1907	I am deeply committed to resource preservation. Please consider Alternative B for the Lake Crescent alternative, especially the park boundary adjustment. The reason is simply this: PRESERVATION and conservation of this area will limit the destruction of the forest by the state and Feds. Clearcutting is already starting to chip away at the wild areas. We are merely stewards of the land the trees, flora, fauna, birds, animals & waters should be foremost in the minds of all of us. Truly. There are zero places in the U.S. that have what we have a TREASURE. A GEM. Let's remember that. Developers will always be knocking at the door. Please keep it shut. The Olympic National Park deserves our response. Thank you so much for this opportunity. I'm speaking on behalf of MANY.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1908	190606 - MASTER FORM LETTER		Seattle	WA
1909	Dear Draft General Management Plan,			
1910				
1911	I am writing to urge you to conduct the necessary eligibility studies			
1912	of all rivers in the Olympic National Park and recommend Olympic's			
1913	outstanding rivers to Congress for inclusion in the national Wild and			
1914	Scenic Rivers system, in the current General Management Planning			
1915	process. This analysis is required under the Wild and Scenic Rivers			
1916	Act and the National Park Service's management policies.			
1917				
1918	Rivers such as the Hoh, Quinault, Queets and others deserve the added			
1919	protection of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. These rivers and others			
1920	in Olympic National Park provide critical habitat for endangered			
1921	salmon, steelhead and bull trout. Current Park Service practices to			
1922	maintain year-round road access in flood-prone valleys have damaged			
1923	important spawning habitat. I disagree with the Park Service's			
1924	emphasis in the Preferred Alternative on maintaining year-round road			
1925	access over protection of natural river processes and endangered			
1926	salmon, steelhead and bull trout.			
1927				
1928	Finally, I urge you to help recover salmon populations and protect			
1929	wild rivers by expanding Park boundaries in five key watersheds, as			
1930	proposed in Alternative B. The Preferred Alternative takes an			
1931	important step toward this goal, but leaves out important protections			
1932	for the Hoh and Quinault rivers			
1933				
1934	Thank you for your consideration of my comments.			
1935	188563		Seattle	WA
1936	To whom it may concern:			
1937				
	Of the alternatives presented in the OLYM Draft GMP/EIS document, I strongly advocate for Plan B, with increased emphasis on preservation of cultural and natural resources. With the regional population expected to see tremendous increase, development and human impact will cause stress to the ecosystem in and of itself, from both direct (increased recreational use etc.) and indirect (more people=more cars, plane flights, pollution etc) sources. Encroaching development already threatens the national park in visible ways. It is a treasure to be respected and nurtured. Once development happens, the natural environment is never given back.			
1938				
1939				
1940	Please impement Plan B.			
1941	190816		Prescott	AZ
1942	Dear folks- here are my brief comments on the draft GMP for Olympic.			
1943				
1944	I have 4 points-- 1- please use Alternative B for protecting river habitat and salmon populations. 2'please recommend all 13 rivers for Wild and Scenic protection. 3'please act to fully restore wolf and fisher populations. 4'please no new commercial developments inside the park. Place any future campgrounds, etc. outside the park.			
1945				
1946	Thank you for the opportunity to comment.			
1947				
1948	190525		Pflugerville	N/A

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
1949	Subject: Olympic Hot Springs Whether there is a complete hotel facility or the location is returned to it's natural unimproved original state the hot springs have always been, and will always be a natural attraction. So the question to be determined is how and to what extent the NPS should/can be a part of this wonderful location. I have backpacked in the Rockies, the Sierras, and the Pacific Range. In the 70 & 80's I would carry a trash bag on my way down the mountain picking up trash as I left an area. Last summer in the Rockies, hiked the Continental Divide and spent the last night at some hot springs on the West side near Pagosa Springs Colorado. Although a natural avalanche had occurred and tore up the camping and hot springs. There was no trash, excessive campfire rings, or destruction of the area by people. The Leave No Trace message has arrived and is being implemented.			
1950	This was not true 25 years ago. In my opinion, the NPS should leave the springs alone and let the people build their pools to let them soak without commercial development. It is a primitive area and let it stay that way. The only requirements that the NPS should be responsible for are bear proof trash receptacles at the drive up trail head and maybe porta potties or dry compost bathrooms. And a very strongly stated message board defining the creed of LNT camping and hiking. I would be in favor of heavy fines for those that leave trash and bring glass containers into the parks. The discussion of clothing optional usage will always arise. In all my back country, beaches, and remote area adventures, I continue to arrive at a site to find some people with and without suits. There is an unwritten rule that states whomever is there first sets the pattern for the day. I was in some springs in Northern New Mexico and some hikers came upon us using the springs.			
1951	The lady in the group came over and asked if we minded if they went in without suits. My wife and I didn't mind, we told them so, and ended up making some new friends. So to summarize, in my opinion, provide trash receptacles and toilets at the trail head, and a big strong sign stating that trash, and glass abuse will not be tolerated. The people using the springs will maintain the pools in a natural state, let them do it. Thank you for your time,			
1952	189393		Portland	OR
1953	The current alternatives offered by the Park Service do not			
1954	provide the appropriate mix of visitor use with resource			
1955	protection. I'm not certain where initial public input came from			
1956	or how it was determined that certain comments were more			
1957	important than others but the plans you outlined are well below			
1958	my expectations for such a beautiful area.			
1959				
1960	All I can say is that I love this park and have had fantastic			
1961	experiences in the park. Further development as noted in your			
1962	plan will diminish the value of the park, degrade resources and			
1963	fail to properly protect this wonderful area for future			
1964	generations.			
1965				
1966	Please reveiw the National Parks Conservation Association's			
1967	"Guarding park Resources and wildlife, Transportation, Gateway			
1968	Communities and recreation Opportunities for our Descendants".			
1969	This is the alternative I support instead of any of the four			
1970	outlined in the Olympic's draft general management plan.			
1971				
1972	NPCA's alternative better protects visitor enjoyment, gateway			
1973	communities and park wildlife and resources, calling for the			
1974	maintenance and full staffing of visitor centers, as well as			
1975	needed boundary adjustments.			
1976				
1977	PLEASE adopt NPCA's "Greater Good" alternative. Please think			
1978	past our generation to ensure the continued stewardship of this			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/Provin
2	Correspondence			
1979	resource for many more generations to come. Thank for			
1980	considering my views.			
1981				
1982	190793			
1983	Letter on File	PEER	Olympia	WA
1984	190944		Shelton	WA
1985	I have been a user of the Olympic National Park for several years and a volunteer stock packer with my husband supporting your trail crews and ranger staff in the Hoodspport Distric for 8 years. I do not want to see any more trails or stock camps closed to horses. My time spent in the Park, with my horses and mules, has been most rewarding. It's amazing to travel over ta trail system historically so old and still in good maintenance that packers and riders have used for so long. To close these trails to stock would eliminate this chance for stock users to ride in the breathtaking beauty that our forefathers also found so magnificent.			
1986	190805		Shelton	WA
1987	I have been a user of the Olympic National Park for several years and a volunteer stock packer supporting your trail crews and ranger staff in the Hoodspport District for 8 years. My main concern is that no more trails or camps be closed to stock access. Historically all of the trails and camps were open to riders and packers. These trails were built for stock and designed to be supported by stock. Through past management decisions, many of these trails have been closed. I do not want to see any more of these facilities closed.			
1988				
1989	I have seen that it is purposed that all stock camps above 3500 feet are to be closed. I do not think this is a wise proposal. If more then one stock packer is in that drainage then there is no place for them to go, but to over crowd the one remaining approved camp. In the event Bear Camp was to be closed, everyone would be forced to crowd into Deception Creek Camp. The impact on the environment and non-stock campers at this sight may develop some very negative results. Normally if one camp in a drainage is occupied then the rider/packer can press-on to the next camp were they can stay in more reasonable accommodations. When there are too few stock camps on a trail the element of safety becomes an issue. If a stock camp is too crowded with additional numbers of horses or mules, they may endanger each other, the riders or handlers and/or non-stock campers. If a rider/packer is attempting to travel to an approved camp below the 3500 foot mark over a pass/divide, and is delayed by weather or desecrated trail conditions (i.e. blow down or slide), because of purposed regulation change they may be forced to press on past what would and has been a good stock camp (i.e. Bear Camp).			
1990	This kind of forced march is dangerous if the weather deturiates or darkness overcomes them. At that point, they either travel on in an unsafe environment or camp in a facility that is not able to support stock. All of the above negative scenarios could have been avoided by leaving open the existing stock camps above 3500 feet. The reality is that there are only three, but their closure will have a negative impact on stock use.			
1991	It is very difficult and not very reasonable to expect the public to decide on the "A" thru "D" purposed plans. These plans have so many agency needed agendas that one is at a loss to decide what is best for the whole. I do not like the process that makes me decide on what is just best for me. I prefer the choice of what is best for all. At this crossroad, I think that the plan "D" is, in my opinion, the best choice. It seems to leave the park in the most workable position, that of where it is today. The other plans appear to me that the baby may be thrown out with the bath water.			
1992				
1993	My only but greatest concern is that the Olympic National Park remain open to stock users as it is today without any more closures of trails or camps to riders and packers. Again, historically, this has been open to all stock users.			
1994				
1995	190786		Chesterfiel	MO
1996	We write to submit comments on the draft General Management Plan for Olympic National Park. A friend was once a summer employee in Olympic park. For us it is also a point of civic pride that one of the founders of Olympic National Park was the late Irving Brant, editorial page editor of the St. Louis Star-Times in the 1930s.		d	
1997				
1998	We compliment the National Park Service for several positive things in the draft plan, but we cannot endorse your "preferred alternative" (alternative D) because it promotes too much development and it fails to adopt essential conservation measures. It should be strengthened with elements from alternative B.			
1999				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2000	We urge you to propose the boundary additions in Alternative B, using watershed and ecological boundaries, namely Ozette Lake, Crescent Lake, Hoh River, Queets River, and Quinault River. These would add 87,000 acres to the park to better protect salmon and trout spawning areas and elk habitat. The half-measures in Alternative D are not adequate.			
2001	We also urge the adoption of "river protection zones" in Alternative B.			
2002	We oppose the expanded "development zones" in Alternative D, especially those in the Elwha River valley and Sol Duc, where your proposal contemplates a three-fold expansion of commercial buildings and campgrounds. Instead, you should promote more appropriate tourism facilities in gateway communities, as at Sringdale and Kanab, Utah, gateways to Zion National Park. Please hold the line against development.			
2003				
2004	We commend the proposed "intertidal reserves" along the Olympic coast and the studies of optional public transportation for Hurricane Ridge, Hoh River, and Sol Duc. Comparable transit has reduced traffic congestion in other parks. We also favor wilderness studies of the Ozette Lake and Crescent Lake areas, as in Alternative D.			
2005				
2006	Please remember the national interest must come first. You should never compromise the integrity of Olympic National Park. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.			
2007	190650 - MASTER FORM LETTER	Lazelle Nature Photography	Quilcene	USA
2008	PLEASE defer all decisions relating to wilderness until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed and available for public review.			
2009				
2010	PLEASE keep developed areas at their current size as described in alternative A. New developments should remain OUTSIDE the national park.			
2011				
2012	PLEASE restore species like the wolf and fisher.			
2013				
2014	PLEASE establish river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural river processes as proposed in Alternative B and design all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild & Scenic river designation.			
2015				
2016	PLEASE expand park boundaries in five areas - Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, Hoh, Queets and Quinault watersheds) to protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife as proposed in Alternative B.			
2017				
2018	Olympic National Park's HIGHEST PRIORITY should be preserving its natural systems, restoring threatened wildlife and protecting the integrity of its world-class wilderness.			
2019				
2020	Thank you for reviewing my comment. I would like to also take time to thank you for establishing intertidal reserves on the Olympic Coast and recommending wilderness study for Ozette Lake!			
2021	190542		Vashon	WA
2022	Another voice encouraging you to expand the boundaries of ONP (OLYM), while preserving traditional right-of ways such as Hwy 101.			
2023	190951	Port of Port Angeles	Port Angeles	WA
2024	Letter on File.			
2025	191255	Sequim-Dungeness Valley Chamber of	Sequim	WA
2026	Letter on File			
2027	190896		Port Angeles	WA
2028	The Olympic National Park is filled with wonderful land features and originally was only 260,000 acres or so. Much more needs to be accomplished with the land that is already within present boundaries.			
2029				
2030	The public pressure for visitations is going to increase dramatically with increased population, ready or not, so spend your money wisely.			
2031				
2032	New forestry rules have been installed just outside the Park by the State which greatly reduces the need for buffers.			
2033				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2034	More contracting out needs to be used like using the State patrol instead of rangers for traffic control, and road maintenance and fire fighting. Volunteer programs need to be encourages as ususal.			
2035				
2036	I am in favor of alternative D for most areas as presented in Port Angeles except the following:			
2037				
2038	Ozette - moving the boat launch at Swan Bay is a good idea to get away from the river. Motorized vessels need to be used in stormy weather in order to navigate safely. The lake is a long way from any where and so camp groudns and a ranger station are a necessity. 400 homesteaders once occupied the land around the lake and all of the area has been logged at leased once mostly twice so the area is not pristine like most of the Park.			
2039				
2040	Hurricane should be ready to take the brunt of the visitors.			
2041				
2042	Deer park the gravel roads are best to help keep speed down and to avoid very costly road improvements in a tough area.			
2043				
2044	Areas like the Queets and the Hoh also should keep their gravel roads due to frequent washouts.			
2045				
2046	Quinault - the native Americans have their own set of rules which governs most of the area; keep the area rustic and don't spend a lot of money. The big trees are very unique and need to be available.			
2047				
2048	Kalaloch - the best beach on the coast of Washington - provide for a whole lot more visitors. The rest of the coast is inaccessible.			
2049				
2050	Wilderness - a lot more people need to get out in it to experience it. The park is already big enough in proportion to the surrouding area, so the Park has the responsibility to provide a lot more access and services than any other Park. Roads and trails need to be provided. The proposed expansion is not needed.			
2051	190695		Poulsbo	WA
2052	Hurricane Ridge Alternative C; Deer Park Alternative A or D; Wilderness Alternative C; Quinault Alt C; Ozette ; Hoh Alt C; Mora Alt C with no boat service to La Push; Kalaloch Alt C; Staircase Alt C Please rebuild bridge across river; Dosewallips Alt D Please reopen road ASAP; Sol Duc Alt C; Elwha Alt C leave visitor constructed hot springs; Lake Crescent Alt D			
2053				
2054	Please continue to provide public access to this public park.			
2055				
2056	I sometimes get the feeling that some groups are trying to restrict access to this park and make Oly National Park a "nature preserve" and not for access for the general public this must not happen.			
2057				
2058	This is a public park, and continued and improved access for the taxpaying public must be provided.			
2059	190685		None Provided	N/A
2060	Alternative D, Preferred Alternative Hurricane Ridge			
2061	Alternative D Preferred Alternative Deer Park			
2062	Alternative D Preferred Alternative Heart O the Hills, Lake Crescent, Dosewallips, Staircase.			
2063	191160	Citizens of Clearwater Community	Forks	WA
2064	Letter on File			
2065	191015		Redmond	WA
2066	I care very much about the future of the Olympic National Park, which is especially important since the Olympic Peninsula as a whole has been impaired substantially in its recent past with 29% clearcutting in the last generation alone. This leaves a big responsibility for the Olympic National Park in preserving some of Washington's most precious ecosystems. Please pursue a fully restored ecosystem with its original components, processes, and habitat functions intact.			
2067				
2068	Back in 1976, much less was known about ecological impacts than today, so it is beyond me how the current master plan can be a step backwards from that plan. It seem to me that Conservation Northwest has a much more responsible plan, and I urge you to follow their well stated points about			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2069	" park boundaries;			
2070	" river protection zones;			
2071	" federal Wild and Scenic River designation;			
2072	" recovery for threatened species and their habitat, and control of non-native species (including the mountain goats - see http://www.sightline.org/daily_score/archive/2005/04/18/goats_gone_wild).			
2073	" limiting the extent of developed to their current size;			
2074	" high priority for a comprehensive wilderness management plan.			
2075				
2076	I am particularly concerned about the current emphasis on developed recreation and motorized access, which counters diametrically the very reason people enjoy the Olympic National Park!			
2077				
2078	Thank you for your time and consideration.			
2079	190830		Port Angeles	WA
2080	I am a professional acoustic ecologist and Emmy Award winning nature sound recordist who has served as an independent consultant to the National Park Service since 1999 on the subject of soundscape management. I am author of the noise-free interval metric, author of the One Square Inch strategy, and developer of the sound survey'a data collection and management software for mapping natural sound environments.			
2081				
2082	After circling the globe three times in pursuit of my work recording nature sounds, I believe that Olympic Park is one of the most diverse and pristine sound environments of any national park in the world. I moved to Port Angeles in 1994 to be closer to the park's natural soundscapes, recording thousands of subjects, and taught Joy of Listening and Sound Tracking at Olympic Park Institute until 1998.			
2083				
2084	My comments are not as complete as I would like them to be mainly because there needs to be further research before an adequate soundscape management plan can be formulated. This park deserves of a full time acoustic ecologist/soundscape manager, if for no other reason than to make sure that soundscape management is no longer put on the back-burner. The present conditions at the park will not last much longer without adequate protection and this is currently a world-class opportunity for the park and for the surrounding communities. No other place in the world offers such readily accessible aural solitude and this will have a growing importance to tourism where increasing levels of noise pollution in urban areas makes the peace and quiet of nature very attractive.			
2085				
2086	My primary comment would be to recommend that the Final General Management Plan/EIS include a commitment to complete a sound survey of the park within the next five years. How else can we expect to protect this resource if it is not defined in manageable terms? In the 25 years that I have listened and recorded at Olympic Park I have heard many wonderful sounds and I have witnessed some acoustic features destroyed by park staff inadvertently because their value went unrecognized and unappreciated. Who would have thought that a sound could be destroyed?			
2087				
2088	I would like to say that overall the Draft is encouraging and obviously the product of a great deal of thought and effort. I am thankful of this opportunity to make these comments and suggestions.			
2089				
2090	My comments are in two groups. First, the bulleted paragraphs are general comments meant to apply broadly to soundscape management. Second, the table lists specific comments that are tied to pages of the Draft. Not all comments propose changes to the Draft but simply provide points of interest regarding the natural soundscape at Olympic Park.			
2091	General Comments			
2092				
2093	" The Draft makes little mention of actual sounds or specific acoustic features. There are lists of animals, lists of vegetation types, etc., which suggests that NPS is better able to manage these than to manage the soundscape. Specific references to sounds unique to Olympic Park should be included and a commitment to perform a Sound Survey should be made (as mentioned in the introduction).			
2094				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
2095	2096	" There is a misunderstanding about noise impacts that is made over and over again in this document, namely that if a noise stops (as in the temporary use of a helicopter or the short term use of equipment during road construction), the impact stops. This is untrue. In a dramatic example of short term events, sonic booms caused structural damage to cliff dwellings at Mesa Verde. But in a less dramatic example, low flying airplane noise disrupts nesting activity and allows predation of eggs and young birds, the basis of prohibiting aircraft overflights above offshore islands. Also wildlife hear differently than we do; sensitivity thresholds and frequency range are different, too. Just because we do not experience a hearing threshold shift as the result of a noise event, it is not safe to conclude that wildlife have the same experience. Too often, casual human observance is used to replace research. Basic research is needed.			
2097	2098	" Sound travels differently than light. Sounds are vibrations that can travel over great distances, though sight-blinding vegetation and around corners. Soundscape management will need to address noise issues outside of park boundaries, particularly overhead. It may be desirable to divide soundscape management into two parts at Olympic; natural quiet might more aptly be managed under Air Quality and natural soundscapes (and individual nature sounds or acoustic features) retained under the present area of Natural Soundscape.			
2099	2100	" Expansion of campgrounds will affect the amount of noise pollution that is emitted into the surrounding area. There should be noise limits (peak decibel levels and prohibited times) on activities (the current practice), and ambient noise limits (proposed practice). Ambient noise is the amount of noise produced by numerous events measured collectively. Ambient noise limits are more measurable and more manageable than single event based noise limits. Sound level meters should be standard equipment at each visitor center and interpretive exhibit that includes audio. This is not only a required tool for management but an educational tool as well, helping staff and visitors to become acquainted with the dB scale and the relative quiet (commonly less than 35dB) of natural soundscapes when compared to speech (commonly 60 dB).			
2101	2102	" The primeval wilderness zone may need to be re-mapped for actual natural quiet management since the buffer zone is not adequate for sound attenuation.			
2103	2104	" The statement, "set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people," is an important one. Air tourism benefits relatively few visitors and destroys opportunities for many visitors at parks where enjoyment of natural soundscape is desirable, such as Olympic Park. Because Olympic is frequently overcast it appears that air tourism is much less developed here than many other national parks (Grand Canyon, Hawaii Volcanoes). Air tours should be banned at Olympic Park, at least until a sound survey has been completed. Notices can also be sent to the FAA as a requested Flight Advisory and this can be posted at airports where private flight-seeing might originate. Yes, the FAA does regulate the airspace over ONP, but they also do accept requests and to my knowledge no such request has been made by Olympic Park. (See more comments below regarding air traffic control out of Everett.)			
2105	2106	" The protection of the Roosevelt elk is a major and founding purpose of the park. The Roosevelt elk also produce many interesting vocalizations (e.g., bugling) that are both musical and informative, especially when heard from a distance after the sound has traveled through the forest. The sound of the Elk should be placed high on the list of acoustic features to be protected and areas (such as the Queets River Valley and Hoh River Valley) should be recognized as acoustic conservation zones for this purpose.			
2107	2108	" Organic Act of 1916 makes the statement, "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." The definition of impaired needs specific definition regarding the acoustic environment. Permanent damage can result from brief noise exposure. It is a mistake to believe that when a noise is gone the impact is over. There has not been adequate research on this point.			
2109	2110	" I think that it would be appropriate to include a statement/paragraph that points out that low-impact visitor activities (such as nature listening and natural soundscape appreciation) should be encouraged and high-impact visitor activities (such as all forms of motorized recreation) should not. By "encouraged", I mean, the park should invest in 'how-to' exhibits that show/tell visitors how to engage in these activities in a rewarding way. (For example most people do not appreciate that the nature listening experience can radically change with only a small change in the listener's position, similar to how a small change in the adjustment of a musical instrument can change the tone of that instrument. By showing and providing examples of how a visitor can become attuned to the environment, the visitor can take control of the experience and discover the adventure of listening.)			
2111	2112	Specific Comments Item Page Comment			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2113	1 3 Under "Park Overview" after paragraph five, add paragraph that describes the soundscape of Olympic Park.			
2114	2 9 Under "Significance" add bulleted paragraph to recognize ONP soundscape diversity and aural solitude as unique and significant.			
2115	3 10 Under "Primary Interpretive Themes" add "Environmental Communications" as major theme which would include acoustic ecology (sound behavior and animal communications) and environmental education with emphasis on nature listening skills.			
2116	4 13 Under "Air Quality" and "Strategies" possibly include natural quiet management under air quality management.			
2117	5 14 Under "Natural Soundscapes"			
2118				
2119	First paragraph summary should include the two fold value of natural soundscape management, namely that wildlife use the soundscape to carry out life essential message sending and receiving, and visitors enjoy the soundscape both poetically and musically, and can identify species by sound.			
2120				
2121	Desired Conditions&			
2122	ADD the condition that a sound level meter will be used to measure noise levels (standards to be forthcoming) and noise limits will be enforced.			
2123	ADD establish one or more acoustic conservation areas and publish brochures for self-guided walks through these areas.			
2124	ADD the park will perform a Sound Survey			
2125	Under "Natural Soundscapes" and "Desired Conditions" ,continued.			
2126	ADD the park will maintain one or more areas in a condition of complete natural quiet (zero tolerance to human-caused noise intrusions) to provide an area for valuable baseline data.			
2127	Strategies			
2128	ADD Park staff may seek remedies for noise intrusions that originate outside the park. For example, park staff can petition the FAA or individual airlines to avoid routes that produce adverse noise impacts on natural soundscapes or degrade natural quiet.			
2129	ADD create a moratorium on air tour management plans (ATMP) and cease operation of any air tours until a Sound Survey can be completed. A Sound Survey is needed to define the resource that is to be managed.			
2130	ADD Provide interpretive programs and brochures to help visitors become astute listeners and quieter visitors.			
2131	ADD Designate quiet areas within campgrounds (similar to no smoking areas) to raise public awareness of the acoustic environment and to offer quieter camper experiences. These quiet areas should be located in an area best suited for listening to nature, for example adjacent to a babbling brook or next to a cliff that reflects distant sounds.			
2132	ADD Provide staff seminars about the acoustic environment of Olympic Park so that routine maintenance will be more aware of why quieter tools and practices are necessary even though they are sometimes more costly and time consuming.			
2133	6 26 Under "Wilderness" and "Desired Conditions"			
2134	Add "absence of noise intrusions from overhead aircraft" and aural solitude/natural quiet to list of characteristics.			
2135	7 27 Under "Strategies"			
2136	ADD prohibit helicopter flights at any altitude inside wilderness areas unless no other method of travel or mode of observation is possible.			
2137	ADD work closely with natural soundscape and natural quiet management.			
2138	8 32 Under "Museum Collections" and "Strategies"			
2139	ADD Provide the Official Sound Survey of Olympic Park.			
2140	9 33 Under "Visitor Use and Experience&"			
2141	ADD Develop educational materials that help publicize features of Olympic Park that are not widely recognized but significant (e.g., soundscape and natural quiet).			
2142	10 41 Under "Visitor Experiences", Item 2,			
2143	ADD "nature sound recording" to list of activities.			
2144	11 75 Under Soundscapes/Natural Quiet			
2145	Standard noise abatement measures do not exist for places of natural quiet. There needs to be specific measures developed for each area under consideration, preferably by a consulting acoustic ecologist.			
2146	12 87 Under Table 4: Summary of Key Impacts'Soundscapes			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2147	Alternative A (as is) may lead to increase losses of natural quiet (some drastic) and possibly severe loss of acoustic features and significant natural soundscapes. However there is no basis to draw a more optimistic prognosis for any of the alternatives either. There needs to be a Sound Survey. There needs to be the addition of a professional acoustic ecologist to the planning staff of the park (not every park needs this but ONP does). The conclusions presented in this chart are not the result of research but opinions. It would be better to state these as management goals rather than summary findings.			
2148	13 101 Watersheds make practical natural soundscape management units.			
2149	14 117 1938 speech that wilderness preservation is primary management objective supports the need to limit or eliminate air tours and ask the FAA to designate ONP a no-flight zone to all aircraft for the purposes of natural quiet preservation as key component of Olympic Park's backcountry wilderness.			
2150	15 118 Buffer zones of 100-200 feet between roads and wilderness should be more aptly called visual buffer zone. This short distance does little to attenuate noise levels that intrude far into wilderness areas.			
2151	16 118 Natural quiet is also cultural resource because recent research shows health benefits for people who include natural quiet in their lives.			
2152	17 121 The coastal strip is a unique soundscape management area where higher densities of visitor use can be allowed without deterioration of the natural quiet (due to higher ambient sound levels). This strip should have some interpretive exhibits at the trailheads that would make the visitors aware of the listening opportunities, encouraging quiet behavior and preservation of some of the acoustic features, particularly the larger Sitka Spruce logs.			
2153	18 121 The Hoh Valley Rain Forest deserves recognition as an acoustic conservation area. Given the heavy use of this area and the river trail traffic, some sign enhancements would be helpful, particularly at the trailhead and 3.2 miles up the River Trail at the turn-off to One Square Inch.			
2154	19 121 Motorized boat use on any lake, river, or stream, (if allowed) should be restricted to electric motors when it borders a primeval wilderness area. (Motor noise can travel further than predicted over water because of atmospheric stratification.)			
2155	20 122 The NPS should take a proactive stance requesting that the FAA designated ONP a no flight zone. This is currently possible using the new air traffic control tool currently under tested at FAA facilities in Everett. In this new air traffic control model polygons are assigned to aeronautical charts with values that control the airspace above them.			
2156	21 143 Expand winter listening as an activity that emphasizes aural solitude. Snow provides a natural sound deadening material. The dryer, rarer, and colder atmospheric conditions are also reduce sound transmission.			
2157	22 146 Trailhead signs that include information about acoustic conservation are needed, particularly for the One Square Inch project in the Hoh Valley.			
2158	23 147 ONP/ONF Information Station is a logical location for natural soundscape interpretive displays and maps because the westend offers the best opportunities for aural solitude.			
2159	24 147 Lake Crescent			
2160	Marymere Falls offers a unique opportunity to hear the combing filter effect of the hemlock forest when inundated with white noise from the waterfall. It produces a musical humming sound that is not present in areas outside the hemlock forest.			
2161	25 147 After recording beaches on six continents, I dare to say that Rialto Beach is perhaps the worlds most musical beach. The answer to,"Why?" could fill a book.			
2162	26 147 The Hoh Rain Forest, in and around the visitors center should have been an acoustic conservation zone prior to the construction of the center. But failing that, there needs to be special management of this area.			
2163	27 148 Education should favor low impact activities such as nature listening and bicycling over higher impact activities such as motor boating or flight-seeing.			
2164	28 183-184 Given the following statement from the Draft:			
2165				
2166	"Managers must always seek ways to avoid, or to minimize to the greatest degree practicable, adverse impacts on park resources and values&.			
2167				
2168	The prohibited impairment is an impact that, in the professional judgment of the responsible NPS manager, would harm the integrity of park resources and values, including the opportunities that otherwise would be present for the enjoyment of those resources or values&			
2169				
2170	Actions that occur outside park boundaries could cause impairment, but this would not be a violation of the Organic Act unless the National Park Service was in some way responsible for the action. A determination on impairment is made in the "Environmental Consequences" section in the conclusion section for each required impact topic related to the park's resources and values. When it is determined that an action(s) would have a moderate to major adverse effect, a justification for nonimpairment is made. Impacts of only negligible or minor intensity would by definition not result in impairment."(emphasis added)			
2171				
2172	IS THIS CORRECT?			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2173				
2174	29 185 The definitions of long term and short term impacts don't fit well with noise impacts. Redefinition might be warranted.			
2175	30 186 Under Soundscapes'Negligible			
2176	Sentence should end by stating "&mostly unmeasurable and inaudible."			
	31 202 "Natural soundscapes are adversely affected by human-caused sounds in developed areas and along major roads. Logging operations near park boundaries can create noise that detracts from natural soundscapes in the park. Overflights, commercial air traffic, and aerial operations can create adverse impacts on the soundscape from the noise of airplanes and helicopters."			
2177	airplanes and helicopters."			
2178	GOOD			
	32 276 "Any construction of new facilities or utilities under this alternative would cause short-term adverse impacts on local soundscapes in the construction area." This statement sounds logical but is not supported by any research that I know. Just because a noise is no longer heard does not mean that the impact is over or that long term damage has not			
2179	been done to the environment.			
	33 333 An interpretive exhibit of Olympic Park's natural soundscapes could be located at Hurricane Ridge where an "overview" is available out the windows. This exhibit could be audio only, downloadable to iPods via a computer with appropriate cables. The program could also travel with them as they tour the rest of the park.			
2180				
	34 333 The park could develop an interpretive exhibit that describes the "emerging voice of the Elwha River." As the dam is removed and the river runs wild again the sound of the river will change. This is the reverse situation of the Hetch Hetchy River in Yosemite NP whose voice is described by John Muir and becomes lost when it is dammed in the early			
2181	1900's.			
2182	35 333 Rialto Beach needs interpretive exhibit (see comment #25, above).			
2183				
2184				
2185	End of public comment.			
2186	190821			
2187	Please implement a plan to keep operations of Olympic national park going		None	N/A
2188	the right way.		Provided	
2189	The park itself needs to be kept open for those, like me, who haven't			
2190	visited your park yet, and for those who have enjoyed their visits.			
2191	This national park doesn't need to be turned into oil fields or logging			
2192	outfits for timber companies, etc., at all.			
2193	Thanks for your time.			
2194	190912			
	Oppose any further land acquisition by Olympic National Park. I share the opinion of many people living around ONP. The park owns enough land. I oppose any further land acquisition by the park. Leave private owners alone. My special concern is the huge land grab proposed for the Lake Ozette area. It is wrong to remove land owned by Merrill &		Port	WA
2195	Ring. They are good stewards and provide jobs. Needed jobs.		Angeles	
2196				
	Secondly, to take land from private owners, who are good stewards is wrong. Many of them live on homesteaded land from the turn of the century. Since you don't want their land in			
2197	the park (Hoko-Big River area) but want to trade mineral rights with Washington DNR - you should leave those people alone.			
2198	189844			
	I would be in support of Alternative C. I feel that the public, as taxpayers, should have as much access to the areas of the park as possible and reasonable. I feel that things are getting much too restrictive. With our retired population here in Sequim, people that are not so able bodied should be able to have easy access to some beautiful areas. I also feel that the fishing regulations within the park are much too restrictive. The beardsley trout in Lake Crescent are there, but no one ever gets to see them. We should be able to fish for them with downriggers and keep 1 a year, as well as other fish in Lake Crescent. The general fishing regulations in the park are much too restrictive. We should be able to fish for and keep trout in Lake Mills now while we are waiting for the dam to be taken out. More rangers and interpreters should be made available to educate the public to be kind to the		Sequim	WA
2199	resources while they are using them.			
2200	191170			
2201	Letter on File		Seattle	WA
2202	190887		Bremerton	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2203	For me Alternative C with visitor opportunities emphasis is the preferred alterantive. Let the current population make use of Olympic National Park. With the loss of the timber industry, tourism was supposed to be the replacement economy. Access to Staircase and the Dosewallips must be a priority.			
2204	191219 Our family has been on Ozette Lake many week-ends. We love the lake as it is now. We have not observed excessive motor usage. We ourselves are growing oldera nd feel the need of motor usage. We ask that things be left as they presently are now. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."		Federal Way	WA
2205	190704		Amanda Park	WA
2206	2207			
2207	More maintenance on what already works; less close it; put up plastic junk. July Creek Rest Room's.		Chimacum	WA
2208	190930 Having lived in western Washington all my life, I treasure ONP. I am an equestrian, and I own stock animals (llamas), too. In considering the Management Plan, I would request that all trails currently open to stock use remain so. Fewer and fewer of us get "out" into the back woods, and as we all age (I'm 48), it's harder and harder to do so using "shanks mare". would hate to see motorized vehicles in the back country trails, but appreicate very much being able to get there with the help of my stock. As a member of Back Country Horsemen , I have participated in and appreciate and the hours and hours of volunteer work that is provided by groups like BCHW to keep trails open and maintained. Should the Parks elect to prohibit stock, much of that volunteer effort will be impossible in the future. Please keep trails open to stock - and we'll keep working on them and edcuating the public in Leave No Trace principles. Thank you			
2209	Trace principles. Thank you			
2210	190871	BCHW	Chimacum	WA
2211	As someone who has enjoyed visiting the backcountry areas of Olympic National Park for many years, I find myself confronting some negative emotions with regard to this General Management Plan, primarily because it connotes change, and people fear change. I am no different. As I get older I find that I am no longer able to carry my own pack, and have begun using stock animals and horses to get around instead of relying on my failing knees. When I read the proposed changes, I worry that I will no longer be allowed to enjoy the peace and inner joy I experience when exploring the trails and high country, or fishing the rivers and streams that run through the Park. While I support the idea of preserving habitat, and enhancing the wilderness experience, I reject the notion that this requires restricting access to traditional users of the Park.			
2212	If Alternative D is the preferred option of the Park Service, then I ask that it be written in such a way that all trails that are currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness area that are currently open to stock should remain open to stock in the ONP General Management Plan and not be zoned as either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone, both of which would be closed to stock use, if my understanding of these terms is correct. I also would like the rivers and streams, and their attendant shorelines, remain open to fishermen who exercise good judgement and follow the restrictions on seasons, tackle, and catch limits.			
2213	The National Park Service has done a fine job of managing these resources for decades. I feel that little needs to be done to improve upon that record. On the whole, I find Alternative A to be my preferred option, but Alternative D is acceptable with the above mentioned caveats. I do not support any changes that significantly alter the traditional uses of the park for myself or for the many residents of this peninsula who look on the Park as our back yard.			
2214	191163		Port Angeles	WA
2215	I am writing concerning "The 20 year General Management Plan." First off. Why does the Olympic National Park need more land? They already have nearly one million acres that they cannont Take Care Of. They are always wanting volunteers to do their work for nothing. All of the maintenance would just fall more behind if there were more miles and acres to take care of. The National Park needs to use the money they receive to improve what they have Already!!!			
2216				
2217	No. 1: A big problem is Lake Crescent. It is such a beautiful lake but there are so many restrictions on it that it is barely used. It needs to be stocked with rainbow trout and people allowed to fish without so many rules and regulations. The boating restrictions need to be changed so people can use their boats on this beautiful lake also.			
2218				
2219	No. 2: A priority needs to be put on saving the Wedding Rocks Pictographs!! The Wedding Rock itself is already brokedn and part of it washed out to sea. Are you going to be resposible to help save these thousands of years old wonderful ancient drawings, or are they going to be lost forever to the Pacific Ocean? A helicopter and ships could be used to haul them to the Neah Bay Museum and the Makah Tribe would more than likely help with the finances of the move.			
2220				
2221	I have been to Lake Ozette camping and hiking several times. There should be improved camping sites and more of them not take more land there!! ALso improved boat launchings and more of them. The Lake Ozette should be left the way it is for boating and fishing!!			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2222				
2223	No. 3: The Olympic Hot Springs Road should be repaired and extended again, so more people could use the lovely campground and visit the Hot Springs which could be a money making enterprise if the park would reestablish some of the pools; have a Ranger there full time and allow more use of this natural wonder for the Public!! We need more use of the ONPark not less. The money should be allocated from all the fees you are NOW getting and don't take more land, which means less taxes for our state off the tax rolls.			
2224				
2225				
2226	NO. 4: One thing that would be another money maker for the ONPark would be a Tram or Cable Car into our beautiful Olympics. Many elderly, disabled, and ordinary visitors would be able to see into the interior of the Olympics!! A starting place could be the "Silver Forest" by the Zig Zag Trail up to Klahhane Ridge. Or maybe up the Sol Duc Valley above Mink Lake to the Ridge on one map I have, called "Little Divide." It is the ridge above the Bogachiel River.			
2227				
2228	The Congress should fully fund the National Parks to fully meet the care and keeping them as show places for the rest of the world to see. They are precious and need caring for. If we can house and care for terrorists who are out to take us and kill us all, costing billions, we should be able to have some monies to enable our National Parks to be maintained and greater facilities in them.			
2229				
2230	The National Park Rangers should not have to be policemen but helpers, guides and educators for it's visitors. We feel the Management Plan number one, to leave the park as it is now, with nearly one million acres, is the best plan. And not take on more land problems that they cannot take care of.			
2231	188330		Sequim	WA
2232	Hello NPS			
2233	I am writing today in response to an article that was printed in the Peninsula Daily News from Port Angeles, WA in June of this year. As part of a divorce decree we are having to sell our 5 acres that is part of your annexation zone. Circled in print out of the article. Besides being 5 acres of 55 year old timber, it also has a 3 story, four bedroom, 1508 square foot cabin type house, built out of old growth cedar and fir. Palmquist creek runs through the property, then into the Lake. It's about 1/5 mile off the main road and the driveway is built up about 6 feet deep from the main road, and runs the whole 330 feet through the property. Green Crow Timber Co has right of way beyond the property, but they don't access their timber through the property. It's a 10 minute walk to the lake and about 1 hour walk to the beach, one of the only wilderness beaches on the west coast. We're one of only 4 residents that have walking access to this beach and one of about 12 residents in your annexation zone.			
2234	We are grandfathered in on a 1996 Clallam County zoning law, requiring 80 acres to build a resident on. We have been ordered to sell it by Judge Woods from Clallam County Superior Court for \$160,000 dollars, which I feel is a steal. Just to rebuild the home would cost near the asking price. The timber is valued at about \$80,000. I'd like to hear back from you soon, as I'm gonna put it up for sale to the general public. The Makah National have expressed interest in it. I'd like to sell it to the NPS first, with the agreement of a life lease of Janet Hunter and myself. We understand how the life lease works, as you've made the offer to others at Ozette Lake before. I need to hear back from you ASAP. We go back to court on 7-21-06 to Judge Woods. I'd like to have something from you to take to him. Thank you for your time.			
2235	190740		Seattle	WA
2236	I am totally against restricting or not allowing motorized boating activities on Lake Ozette. Lake Ozette is the third largest lake in the state of Washington. The lake should be available for all to enjoy not just a select few who are young enough or healthy enough to paddle a canoe or kayak. By not allowing motorized boating the park would be discriminating against the elderly, the ill, and all people with disabilities that prevent them from cannoing or kayaking. The lake should be for all to enjoy.			
2237	191245		Seattle	WA
2238	As a property owner on the East shore of Lake Ozette, I am very much opposed to the idea of limiting or prohibiting the use of motors on Lake Ozette. This proposal would take away one of our means of access to our property. This restriction is certainly no necessary as there is no conflict between motorized boats and kyaks or canoes. During the week of September 11, 2006 at Lake Ozette we saw one motorized boat, zero kayaks and zero canoes. During the week of July 3rd, 2006, we saw one motor boat and 2 kyaks. This lake is not a heavily used lake by either motorize or non motorized boast. Therefore, I do not think it is in the public interest to further restrict its usage by limiting its use to a selected few that are able to canoe or kyak.			
2239				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2240	According to the Seattle P.I. Sept. 28th 2006 National Parks are seeing 20% fewer campers than 10 years ago. Overnight stays are down by 13.8 millino between 1995 and 2005. Overnight stays in the state of Washington's national parks ahve dropped from 924,194 in 1995 to 698,783 in 2005. With this decline it does not make sense to restrict the use of Lake Ozette by limiting or eliminating the use of motor boats. Keep in mind this is the third largest lake in the state of Washington. Because of its proximity to the Pacific Ocean it can be calm and peaceful water one minute and high swells the next. We the residents (part time) have come to the aid of many boaters, canoeists, and kyakers over the years. Several people have drowned including some homesteaders. The waters of Lake Ozette can be dangerous.			
2241				
2242	We hope that this beautiful, yet little used lake, will continue to be used by all people that want to enjoy the beauty of this area.			
2243	190886		Seattle	WA
2244	Senator Jackson - 10/1/76 "Mr. President (of the Senate) I wish to clarify two points to section 332 of the HR 13713 which modifies the boundaries of the Olympic National Park. The last sentence of this paragraph reads: "I think it shoudl be pointed out that it is expected that the present access sites available around the lake will be maintained by the National Park Service in a way that will allow use by private land owners as well as visitors to the park who may wish to boat in this outstanding area."			
2245				
2246	I do not think that Senator Jackson's intention was to limit or eliminate the use of motors on this lake. If he had intended to restrict same, he would have used the words kyaks or canoe's instead of the word boat. He was quite aware that motorized boats were necessary to the property owners of this lake as well as visitors to the park.			
2247	188400		Sekiu	WA
2248	Hello,			
2249	I would like to add my comment to The Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Olympic National Park.			
2250	I am doing this via email because I will not be able to attend an Open House Meeting.			
2251	My Comment;			
2252	I have thoroughly read the Draft GMP/EIS for Olympic National Park and agree with most of the provisions of the "Preferred Alternatives".			
2253	As I have watched logging operations near Streams and Rivers which feed into Lakes in the Park slowly degrade the Water Quality and Fish Populations in those areas, The idea of Purchasing Land to protect Streams, Rivers, and Lakes is of special interest to me and I agree that this should be a Priority.			
2254	I Do Not Agree with Restricting Motorized Boating on Lakes within the Park for the following reason.			
2255	To do so would Restrict Access and Recreational Opportunity for The Elderly and Handicapped.			
2256	I am a 58 year old Disabled Veteran and hate to think that my age and disability would deny me the opportunity to enjoy any part of this Great Country I served to protect.			
2257	Please give Serious Thought to my comment. Thank You for the Opportunity to give my input into this process.			
2258	191205		Seattle	WA
2259	I object to motor boat restrictions on Lake Ozette. As a young person I have enjoyed paddling the lake multiple times to camp on the ocean and sightsee. As an middle aged adult with physical disabilities I would like to be able to tour the lake with my 13 year old daughter. We have a 13 foot long boston whaler that we plan to use on Lake Ozette next spring. I could support speed limit enforcement.			
2260	190699		Opotiki	N/A
2261	My property on Umbrella Bay is the largest privately owned property on the shoreline of Ozette. See: www.lakeozette.com my website to sell my property. I'm 76 years old and it is time to sell my property. I'm fearfull of the process because I don't have the stamina to go into a battle with government agencies. Since this property has had such a profound influence on me over the last 50 years, I'd like to have closure by getting some financial relief in my waning years.			
2262	190844		None Provided	N/A
2263	I am a park user and want to comment before you start spending all kinds of time and money on this treasure, our park:			
2264				
2265	. establish river protection			
2266	zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural			
2267	river processes are preserved, as proposed in Alternative B.			
2268				
2269				
2270	* recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal			
2271	Wild and Scenic river designation.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2272				
2273	* recommend restoration of			
2274	extirpated species like the wolf and fisher.			
2275				
2276	* limit development zones inside park			
2277	boundaries to current uses. New commercial developments,			
2278	campgrounds and RV parks should be located outside the park.			
2279				
2280	defer controversial decisions relating to designated			
2281	Wilderness until a comprehensive			
2282	wilderness management plan is completed.			
2283				
2284	As population and recreational demand on the park increase,			
2285	and land use patterns change around the park, managers must be diligent			
2286	in protecting Olympic's outstanding natural qualities.			
2287				
2288	Olympic National Park's highest priorities should be			
2289	non-degradation of natural systems			
2290	and restoration of critical ecosystem functions.			
2291				
2292	Many have made the above suggestions, and I am one of them.			
2293	Thank you for taking care of our park.			
2294	190909		Seattle	WA
2295	Letter on File.			
2296	191024		Port Angeles	WA
2297	During the past few months we have studied the comprehensive management plan for Olympic National Park. After reviewing the four alternatives for the management of Olympic National Park we are strongly recommending the "no-action" alternative, alternative A.			
2298				
2299	We also recommend the repair and reopening of the Dosewallips Road, no relocation of the Kalaloch Lodge and cabins, use of motorized boats should remain at Lake Ozette and no further land acquisitions. The "willing seller willing buyer" concept should remain in effect.			
2300	190942		Port Angeles	WA
2301	Letter on File			
2302	190943	North Olympic Timber Action Committee	Port Angeles	WA
2303	The North Olympic Timber Action Committee is a non profit, grassroots organization. We organized in Feb. 1989 to support laws, rules, and regulations which enhance commercial forest management. We also support a stable economy and a healthy balanced environment and we will oppose any effort to curtail or eliminate commercial forest activities.			
2304				
2305	We cannot begin to express our disappointment in the quality of the draft management plan. It appears to have been poorly researched and hastily written! This GMP draft is an unbelievable waste of taxpayer money. It is grossly lacking in economic data and understanding of the contributions of the forest industry to the Olympic Peninsula and specifically Clallam County.			
2306				
2307	We oppose any expansion of the boundary line for the Olympic National Park under any alternative mentioned in the draft or developed in the final plan. There are a number of reasons for this statement:			
2308	Approximately 90% of the land base within Clallam County is owned by State or Federal Agencies and Tribes. The County Treasurer receives only 21 cents an acre for 518,812 Federal acres within our County. Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILTS) are in danger of being eliminated by Congress in the next few years.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2309	The citizens of the US by default transfer the tax burden of these Federal lands to the citizens of Clallam County. We do not want or need productive timberland converted to more Federal Land!			
2310				
2311	The Olympic National Park has decreased its' contribution to family wage jobs impacting the local economy due to your own budget cuts (see note 1 on pg 64) and the corresponding cuts in tourist experience, closures or curtailed programs in campgrounds, backcountry trails, shelters and bridges/roads closed or curtailed due to lack of maintenance. There are huge maintenance backlogs of Park facilities, roads and, bridges affecting the visitor experience and local residents. It is difficult to understand why Olympic National Park needs to expand boundaries when they cannot properly take care of what they have already!			
2312				
2313	Land Protection/Boundary Adjustments (Pg. 64) are not realistic land acquisition figures and are a good example of how out of touch the writers are with our region and the value of timberland.			
2314				
2315	The timber industry has spent years supporting rules and regulations to meet the Federal laws for clean air, water and endangered species so there could be some certainty to continue forest management practices and timber harvest. We believe that Washington forests meet the strictest land regulations in the world. If Park boundaries are expanded, another layer of restrictions are added to forest practice applications for forest landowners (Class IV-special) and will make it more difficult and less economic to manage forestlands. Next comes the reduction in property values due to excessive regulations and the Park can take advantage of the "willing seller" at a discounted price.			
2316				
2317	The draft plan mentions Forest Stewardship Certification management for lands that would be acquired for Washington Department of Natural Resource from privately owned timberland that ONP would hope to buy and trade for scattered mineral rights held by the DNR. The DNR has a constitutional mandate to manage their assets to produce income for various trust beneficiaries. The Park has no business mentioning DNR management practices in this draft plan. (pg. 35)			
2318				
2319				
2320	The economic analysis is vague and incomplete. (pages 162-174) There is no mention of the importance of the family wage jobs contributed by the timber and manufacturing sectors pg. 167) under major industries. Your employment data (table 18) is from 1999. In the past 2 years the forest products sector has invested \$50 million dollars in new manufacturing facilities, creating over 150 direct family wage jobs with benefits in Port Angeles alone. This does not include additional logging and trucking jobs plus the jobs created from having a healthy economy. The Shelton area has also had facilities improvements and job additions matching those in Clallam County. Your draft does not reflect current economic data and the data you have is poorly written. The Washington Forest Protection Association has substantial data on the economic contributions of the forest products industry to the State of Washington. The Clallam County Economic Development Council could also have provided you with more updated and accurate employment information.			
2321				
2322	Page 313 contains a number of dramatic statements: "Human activities are producing global climate changes." There are many opposing scientific views on this topic. What source did you use to justify making this statement?			
2323				
2324				
2325	"Slope failures and increased sediment delivery on private lands associated with roads and timber harvest can adversely affect hydrologic resources. Timber harvesting and road building have substantially affected slope stability and fluvial erosion on lands adjacent to the Park. Increased sediment delivery to streams has changed streams channels and aquatic habitat and also affected coastal ecosystems." Are you making these comments based on past or current conditions? In the past 20 years the forest industry has been very proactive in addressing problems associated with timber harvest and building forest roads. Forest and Fish Rules, Road Maintenance & Abandonment Plans, and Habitat Conservation Plans have focused on fish habitat and water quality improvements. It appears your draft was written about the past and not the present.			
2326				
2327	Overall we find it disappointing, that the draft plan seems to place undue blame on the timber industry for water quality issues. Our industry has spent more money and set aside more habitat and riparian areas than any other business or private sector landowner. Science is proving that active management can create desired conditions faster than the natural process.			
2328				
2329				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2330	The North Olympic Timber Action Committee believes that the Olympic National Park is a huge asset to our region. Private timberland is a part of the tourism experience too. Private timberland is available for hunting, fishing, hiking, mountain biking, berry & mushroom picking and horseback riding. Peninsula residents and tourists take advantage of the many recreational opportunities provided within the ONP and private lands. The Park has dramatically decreased its' services over the past several decades due to budget cuts. That brings up the question why the ONP finds it necessary to expand its' boundaries when it does not have a budget to take care of the current assets?			
2331				
2332	The peak tourist season provides seasonal jobs and is an economic boost to the retail and service sectors in our region but the visitor numbers have been declining. The draft management plan does not explain why the visitor count is declining or how a Park boundary expansion would increase visitor numbers? Please provide us with your analysis of how Park expansion will benefit the tourist economy and justify that benefit against the loss of family wage jobs from the timber industry!			
2333				
2334	The North Olympic Timber Action Committee is firm in our comments and convictions! We do not support any boundary expansion of Olympic National Park! It appears the park is following its' historic pattern of expanding simply for the sake of expansion. The ONP should draft a plan that addresses the current backlog of maintenance and repairs. It should develop a marketing strategy to improve the visitor experience which would include improved facilities, automated or interactive educational programs for remote sites and campgrounds, improve existing visitor information centers with automated information and quality printed material. GETTING BIGGER DOES NOT MEAN GETTING BETTER!			
2335				
2336	We cannot begin to express the disappointment in the quality of the draft management plan. It is full of old or outdated data, and appears to have been hastily written and poorly researched. No private business or industry would plan a future management direction the way this draft plan was written.			
2337				
2338	On February 23, 2006 the U.S. House of Representative, Committee on Resources, stated that "The committee believes that the NPS budget must reflect the following priorities: enhancing the visitor experience, increasing access and reducing the maintenance backlog." (copy enclosed) Olympic National Park should follow that recommendation!			
2339				
2340	Respectfully,			
2341	Carol Johnson			
2342	Executive Director			
2343	NOTAC			
2344	190823		Bellbrook	OH
2345	Retain soaking at Olympic Hot Springs, but consider reducing the number of pools if that is necessary to improve cleanliness. This is a somewhat unique site throughout the entire National Park System.			
2346				
2347	Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail beyond Altair.			
2348				
2349	190680		Bremerton	WA
2350	I trail along the south side of the Dosewallips starting at the bridge below the Elkhorn and connecting to the old Dosewallips Trail near the park boundary would open miles of additional trail at relatively low cost.			
2351				
2352	The trail along the Heart O'the Hills parkway should be completed to give trail access from the city of Port Angeles to the park headquarters, and the entire park trail system.			
2353	190673	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington	Olympia	WA
2354	I am most concerned about keeping all the trails open and accessible. I am very interested in visiting the interior parts of the park since I have never had the opportunity to see it. As I am aging I am concerned about trails being accessible for all abilities, including disabled persons of all ages. I also enjoy horseback riding and ma filling the need for more trails being open to horses since so much land is being developed and we are losing places to ride and enjoy our public lands in the U.S. I am interested in being a volunteer in helping maintain trails for other to enjoy. Please consider having adequate stock facilities for parking at trailheads (restrooms/parking areas/manure bins). We practice LNT. Thank you.			
2355	190787		Bothell	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2356	I am opposed to the limitation or elimination of motors on Lake Ozette.			
2357				
2358	It is discriminatory against elderly or any person with physical handicaps. The lake should be available for all to enjoy, not just a select few.			
2359				
2360	In July 2006 we spend 5 days at Lake Ozette, we only saw one motorized boat.			
2361	191000		None Provided	N/A
2362				
2363	I am writing today to express my gratitude for the work invested in the newly released General Management Plan and all of the out-reach designed to invite comments on the alternative proposals. I have spent many pleasurable days in the Olympic National Park and applaud the efforts to protect it, expand it, and ensure that generations to come will be the recipients of your choice to protect and preserve the park.			
2364				
2365	I recognize the difficulty of reconciling the many competing demands and expectations for the best and wisest use of our public lands, but one need clearly outweighs all others and that is the need to preserve the land and the ecosystem for the many generations to come. At one level this means preserving it from timber interests and over-development, but at another, it also requires preserving the park from over-use. I have seen the documents of the numbers of visitors the Park receives, and accommodating us all must strain the resources in these lean times. To that end, I am advocating the Park adopt the B plan of their three options.			
2366				
2367	What is attractive about the B plan is the moratorium on new trail building which preserves the integrity of the remaining truly wild spaces.			
2368				
2369	During a recent backpacking trip to the Olympics this summer, I and my partner hiked up the Duckabush drainage on a newly improved trail to Marmot Lake. It was an extraordinary hike for the wildlife we saw. We traveled with an older map of the area (1996) which showed no trail beyond Marmot Lake. When we hiked the twenty two miles in, we discovered indeed, not only more park trails, but spur trails carving up a rare alpine basin that was home to Elk and bear. We saw four bear on our visit, but also noted how rare this kind of topography really was, even in the large acreage of the National Parks. It was a basin of lakes and meadows that is prime habitat for bear, elk and the endangered (or threatened) Olympic marmot. And it was carved up in trails. What were once game trails became spur trails, then maintained trails, and we noted later, they are now on the latest map of the region, with bear wires, brushed-out trails, and camps. This is such a fragile region, and a rare topography for the wildlife, I would really advocate for less intrusion into such spaces.			
2370	There is a huge park, but the prime topography of alpine meadows, lakes, caves, blueberries are few and really belong to the wildlife who need them most. There are places we don't have to be. There are places that can be reserved, preserved, just for the wildlife, when we have taken so much else. Therefore, I would strongly urge you to consider adopting your B plan for the park's future, for the future of the wildlife that is the best part of the park, and for the future of all who will be guests there to enjoy it.			
2371	Thank you for considering these comments,			
2372	191179	Green Crow Corporation	Port Angeles	WA
2373	Letter on File			
2374	190818			
2375	Sirs:		None Provided	N/A
2376				
2377	Please consider that we do not live for the forest, but rather, the forest exists for humans. Protecting the forest does not mean either/or -- either you throw people out or the park goes downhill.			
2378				
2379	We are so concerned to protect "nature" that we forget to protect people. In park management and acquisitions, please protect people by protecting their property rights (the basis for all other rights) and their rights to use the parks. We want people to crowd into the cities, but then we want to exclude them from parks? People should take the highest priority in your decisions.			
2380				
2381	190911		Portland	OR
2382	I encourage the Park Service to maintain most of the existing trail shelters in Olympic National Park.			
2383				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2384	For me, the shelters are important connection with the past. When I see one of the old shelters in good repair, I am happy to recall those distant years when I first came to ONP (1962).			
2385				
2386	As I see it, the shelters have the same historical pedigree as the trails and bridges, all of which require a certain level of maintenance.			
2387				
2388	I support a policy under which the Park Service, by timely repairs, would seek to extend the useful lives of these historic structures.			
2389	188661	None	Sequim	WA
2390	Olympic National Park is one of America's true gems - and it should remain that way. I believe that the maximum amount of flexibility to govern the Park should rest in the hands of the Park Superintendent. I am therefore casting my support for Management's Preferred Alternative "D". Thank you for allowing me this input and please keep up the good work.			
2391	189431	The May Valley Company	None Provided	N/A
2392	Please keep the park open to stock use; we at Back Country Horsemen contribute thousand of hours of work on trails each year, both hiking and stock use.			
2393				
2394	With Forest Service budgets being cut each year, Washington State needs to utilize the knowledge and expertise of our trails crews by keeping trails open.			
2395				
2396	Our stock can carry heavy materials like gravel for trails and timber for bridges into fragile areas with minimal damage. Maintained trails keep hikers from cutting new trails and damaging the surrounding areas.			
2397				
2398	Please include a large number of trails open to stock use and we would very much would like a horse camp; I'm sure you would find the volunteers to build it! Thank you very much			
2399	188326	Washington State Department of Transportation	Olympia	WA
2400	Thank you for allowing the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact.			
2401				
2402	Our only comment to the document is in reference to the Kalaloch Alternative (page 341), at this moment, the WSDOT does not necessarily agree or disagree with the preferred alternative to reroute US 101 from its current location within the Kalaloch area. However, this recommendation is neither identified nor has been planned for in the WSDOT Highway System Plan and as such, no planning level cost estimate has been developed nor are funds identified for such a project. At present, funding would have to come from other than WSDOT resources. The Highway System Plan includes a comprehensive assessment of existing and projected 20-year deficiencies on our state's highway system. It also lists potential solutions that address these deficiencies. These solutions serve as the basis for WSDOT capital investment goals and strategies. WSDOT is happy to work with the National Park Service on this issue as it establishes its vision for the future of Olympic National Park.			
2403				
2404	Thank you for your inclusion of WSDOT in this process. We would like to continue to be informed on future actions associated with this planning effort in the event that they may affect WSDOT. If you should have any questions, please contact George Kovich of my staff at (360) 704-3207.			
2405				
2406	Sincerely,			
2407	Robert E. Jones			
2408	Transportation Planning Manager			
2409	WSDOT, Olympic Region			
2410	188664	Citizen	Seattle	WA
2411	Olympic Nat. Park campgrounds should be limited exclusively to campers. Recreational Vehicles (RV's) should have separate pull-in sites than campgrounds. Too often I visit Sol Duc campground only to find it is "Full." When I drive in anyway and check the campground, approximately one third of the campsites are taken by RV's or large towed camping vehicles. This is unfair and not right. RV occupants are not enjoying the quality of nature when they run a generator that powers their tv/dvd player or radio, and run these items loud enough so that other campers have to hear it as well, thereby depriving other campers of their right to enjoy nature.			
2412				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2413	Most of my campground camping is done for overnight trips where I can do a day hike the following day, or embark on a backcountry trip. RV campers deny many regular (tent) campers the opportunity to enjoy the sights and sounds of nature, and deny tent campers the use of campgrounds where there is no other alternative for overnight camping. This is frustrating to me, and frustrating to my friends and family that come from overseas, who want to see and experience the great northwest only to be denied a place to camp because the campground is full, and occupied by RV's or giant towed campers.			
2414				
2415	188604 - MASTER FORM LETTER		Renton	WA
2416	Dear Superintendent Laitner,			
2417				
2418	I fully support the National Parks Conservation Association's			
2419	"Guarding park Resources and wildlife, Transportation, Gateway			
2420	Communities and recreation Opportunities for our Descendants"			
2421	(Greater Good) alternative to Olympic's draft general management			
2422	plan. NPCA's "Greater Good" alternative better protects visitor			
2423	enjoyment, gateway communities and park wildlife and resources,			
2424	calling for the maintenance and full staffing of visitor			
2425	centers, as well as needed boundary adjustments. The current			
2426	alternatives do not provide the appropriate mix of visitor use			
2427	with resource protection.			
2428				
2429	Olympic National Park is one of the most cherished placed in the			
2430	Pacific Northwest. I urge the National Park Service (NPS) to			
2431	adopt NPCA's "Greater Good" alternative. We owe it to future			
2432	generations to ensure the continued stewardship of this			
2433	resource. Thank for considering my views.			
2434	190946		Woodinville	N/A
2435	Certainly, we can limit, or even cease, development in such an unique area to save it for posterity.			
2436	190710		Port Angeles	WA
2437	I strongly disagree with the Olympic National Park's proposal to acquire any additional acreage in the state of Washington. I was pleased and relieved to read that Merrill & Ring, owners of much of the forest land bordering the national park, have indicated they are not interested in selling out to the park. I applaud their decision and hope they remain steadfast. Logging is essential to our economy.			
2438				
2439	Having lived within earshot of the Olympic National Park for many years, I fervently believe you already own far too much land. It is my opinion that the Park would rather prevent American citizens from actually using their National park; and would rather turn it all into wilderness accessible by only a few hearty souls.			
2440				
2441	The Park already owns more land than it can possibly use. Rather than spend millions of taxpayer dollars on more land acquisitions, why not use that money to create more visitor-friendly campsites and trails such as the wonderful one leading up toe Marymere Falls. The Park spokespeople talk about their budgeting constraints and cutting back on services that actually make the National Park worthy of a visit, so how can you even consider spending millions on more land? It doesn't make any sense.			
2442				
2443	Option "A" is the clear choice in my opinion.			
2444				
2445	190845		None Provided	N/A
2446	I would like to register my desire to see the recommedations of OPA implemented. It is frightening to see the loss of our natural world.			
2447	190801		None Provided	N/A
2448	Concerning turning over olympic park to a concessionaire, bad idea, i have worked for several, and they are not taken care of, just thought of as a for profit trash can. So lets be creative, and maybe come up with a solution for more money. How about a lottery.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2449	191003	24th Legislative District	None Provided	N/A
2450	Dear Park Service: We have recently become aware of the Park Service's proposal to update its General Management Plan. We appreciate public processes, and know first hand about the need to balance multiple values and viewpoints. We also appreciate locally developed plans for managing natural resource issues, and feel that agreements developed by collaboration with interested stakeholders are the best way to develop lasting solutions. We understand that the park has hosted several open houses and is now accepting public comment on its Management Plan. The purpose for our writing is to make the Park aware that preferred alternative "D" includes annexation of private forestland, and removal of a substantial amount of commercial timberland from the economic base, in order to protect public resources, without acknowledging the plans that Washington has already put into place to address these issues.			
2451				
2452	One of the things that we as Legislators are most proud of is our 1999 sponsorship, of ESHB 2091, the Forests & Fish Law. The bill, which was supported by a 2/3rds bi-partisan majority of the state Legislature, addressed protection of clean water, salmon and aquatic habitat, and resulted in a 50-year Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), encompassing 9.3 million acres of private and state forestland. The Forests & Fish Law resulted from a science-based forest management plan developed by more than 140 individuals, including 34 federal, state, county, tribal and industry scientists who worked together for 18 months.			
2453	After a decade, the federal government approved the HCP acknowledging that forestry practices in Washington State are protective of salmon and aquatic habitat. The Park needs to be aware that we have addressed the protection of public resource concerns here at the state level.			
2454	Washington's forestlands now have among the highest level of environmental protection in the United States. The forest products industry is the only sector in Washington that has a salmon recovery plan for protecting fish habitat and water quality, backed up by law. We also have some of the best tree growing country in the world, with our combination of rich soils and wet environment, making the practice of forestry Washington State plain common sense.			
2455	It is important that we understand that Washington State has become a leader in its ability to develop local solutions that balance environmental protection and maintain a healthy forest industry.			
2456	With this step forward in resource protection, Washington State becomes the leader not only for environmental protection, but also for its ability to find solutions that balance the protection of our precious natural resources while producing the forestry products that we all use every day.			
2457	Removing another 60,000 acres of commercial forestland from the Peninsula will affect local communities by removing about a year's worth of sustainable harvest volume from the timber basket, in an area that has already suffered economic hardship through the disruption of federal forest policies of the early.			
2458	We encourage the Park to remove the boundary expansion proposal in its preferred alternative "D" and acknowledge the accomplishments made for resource protection here at the local level.			
2459	190981			
2460	You need to avoid sloppy nomenclature about trails. Let's call all trails "trails", not "paths" and "routes" when you are meaning to suggest that they are sketchy or undesirable. The term "social trail" is OK. A "way trail" is a trail caused by people going the same way over and over again, with no particular plan. It is the opposite of an engineered trail, one that was laid out and built rationally. Don't call it a "way trail" if it is an engineered trail that has not been maintained.			
2461	190958		None Provided	N/A
2462	I have reviewed the plan and would like to see Alternative D (the Preferred) utilized. I am an avid horseback rider and enjoy many camping trips. My fondest trips are as a young person traveling with my father all over the Olympic National Forest from Lake Quinault around the 101 loop. I can remember before they built the new lodge at Sol Duc of learning how to swim in the pool.			
2463				
2464	I would really like to see these campgrounds around the Peninsula remain a viable area for individuals to camp with their children in a Leave No Trace Impact and be able to see the sites that I truly loved when I was growing up during the summer months.			
2465				
2466	Please consider the option that keeps all the campgrounds accessible to all user groups young and old. So that as mom's and dad's we can take our children to enjoy nature or as grandparents we are able to show our grand kids the areas we have enjoyed all our lives.			
2467				
2468				
2469	190540		Port Angeles	WA
2470	I strongly urge you to help keep Olympic National Parks integrity as a			
2471	world-class natural area.			
2472				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2473	Preserving the outer coast strip has not only provided future generations with opportunity to			
2474	enjoy the beauty and wonder of nature, it is the right thing to do. Too much of the Earth has			
2475	been destroyed by humans and continued efforts to preserve our parks is critical to our survival.			
2476				
2477	Please recommend adding Ozette Lake, and a secure buffer of the lake, to this important part of			
2478	the wilderness of ONP. Also, please keep all developed areas in the park as they are now -- a			
2479	recommendation of Alternative A. Please NO NEW developed areas. Plan for new services,			
2480	attractions, campgrounds, whatever -- to please be OUTSIDE the park boundary.			
2481				
2482	As usage increases in ONP, and as development of lands near the park continues to spiral upward,			
2483	wider buffers of the unique ecosystems need to be in place. Please do plan to extend the parks			
2484	boundaries around Ozette Lake, and also at Lake Crescent and the wonderful rivers that drain the			
2485	snows of the Olympics to the Pacific Ocean. Much of this extension to the park (included in your			
2486	alternative B) would protect salmon and other wildlife important to the diversity of ONP -- and			
2487	fast disappearing from inhabited areas. Plan to re-introduce animals, the wolves and fishers,			
2488	that once were there.			
2489				
2490	Thank you for the opportunity to share my strong beliefs to continue the great work being done			
2491	and recognition of how much more needs to be done before we lose everything as populations			
2492	increase.			
2493	190811		Tacoma	WA
2494	Hey, I'll try to be brief. I'll also only focus on those areas I know - the			
2495	Queets Corridor and Kalaloch Coastal Strip:			
2496				
2497	1. Either get that Queets River Road re-opened (unlikely w/o a massive			
2498	funding appropriation) or establish vehicle			
2499	access to the Queets Campground and trailhead via the #21 Road (West			
2500	Boundary Road).			
2501	Yes, I know there are issues dealing with DNR, NFS, Quinault Tribe, ad			
2502	infinitem.... I don't care. It's just plain			
2503	SILLY that federal and state agencies can't work in cooperation with			
2504	each other and get something DONE to			
2505	remedy the situation. I could write out a long list of "reasons", but			
2506	basically it boils down to providing access to			
2507	that campground for the car campers, and vehicle access to that			
2508	trailhead. I've hiked the Queets for over 40 years,			
2509	and it's tough enough without that additional distance (along a gravel			
2510	road through cut-over areas on managed DNR			
2511	and NFS parcels). I've talked with a lot of "old timers" who've been			
2512	going up there for years, and they're not happy			
2513	about the situation either. Get a road fixed- Queets River Road or the			
2514	Service Access Road (via #21 road) - either			
2515	way- just get a road fixed. Just get it DONE.			
2516				
2517	2. The idea of building a bridge over the Queets at the trailhead is just			
2518	plain damn silly. Who thought up that idea?			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2519	NO bridge on the Queets. NO NO NO NO and NO again. Good lord. Who thinks			
2520	up this stuff?			
2521				
2522	3. The idea of MOVING Hwy 101 along the Kalaloch Coastal Strip is almost as			
2523	silly as building a bridge over the Queets.			
2524	How ya gonna move a major state highway along that stretch east, when			
2525	it's all marsh and swamp? Come on- that's			
2526	just silly!			
2527	I've worked up there at Kalaloch the last couple years, clearing out			
2528	brush along the beach access trails between South			
2529	Beach and Ruby Beach. I cut brush for about an hour or so, then I have			
2530	to take a break for 10 or 15 minutes. I go			
2531	back up to my truck and have a cup of tea or a sandwich. And then I			
2532	watch people. I talk to some of them. I answer			
2533	questions the tourists have.			
2534	I don't know what your "user studies" have shown you, but here's what I			
2535	see:			
2536	Retired couples in nice sedans, with plates from Florida or Texas,			
2537	driving around the country on vacation. They get out,			
2538	walk down to the beach, spend 15-20 minutes watching the surf, and			
2539	merrily go on their way.			
2540	Young couples with little kids. They boil out of their minivans with			
2541	umbrellas, beach blankets, sand pails and coolers and			
2542	go down and spend two or three hours down at the beach. They walk back			
2543	up to their vehicles, pockets full of sand or			
2544	seashells, with wet shoes, and pile back into their vehicles and take			
2545	off.			
2546	And everything in between.			
2547	And MY perception is: they go ALL the way out there, get out of their			
2548	cars, and spend a very short time down on the			
2549	beach. They get cold, wet, or sunburned, and leave in 15-20 minutes.			
2550	Almost as nutty as the folks I watched all day one			
2551	day up in the parking lot at Paradise at MRNP: driving a thousand miles			
2552	to spend 15 minutes looking at the mountain.			
2553				
2554	And somebody thinks accomodating all those different kinds of users,			
2555	with their frenetic vacation schedules, little kids			
2556	with wet clothes (or diapers), retired couples who just want to get			
2557	out and take a couple snapshots, is going to be done			
2558	by means of a shuttle service? Another silly idea. This is Western			
2559	Washington. This is NOT Yosemite or Glacier or Grand			
2560	Canyon. Forget the shuttle deal. Silly idea first of all, secondly it			
2561	can in NO way ever hope to accomodate the needs of			
2562	those users, and third it's just simply not a practical idea when you			
2563	consider the virtual absence of use during the off-season.			
2564	(Or are you going to have a shuttle bus sitting there waiting for me			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2565	in late November, during one of our ferocious coastal			
2566	storms, when I want to go watch the surf toss driftwood around for a			
2567	couple hours... ???)			
2568				
2569	4. Queets River Trail: I noticed the Park's map changed a bit on the Queets			
2570	Trail. It would appear that the upper end of			
2571	the trail has been designated "primitive, non-maintained". This is a			
2572	mistake, folks.			
2573	I know it's a tough trail to maintain, but you gotta keep it open and			
2574	maintained to Pelton.			
2575	Here's why: If you make the end of the "maintained" trail terminate at			
2576	Tshletshy, or up near Bob Creek, that's where			
2577	you're going to concentrate user impact. Bad idea. Keep that trail open			
2578	(and maintained) all the way to Pelton and			
2579	disperse that user impact up and down that valley. Otherwise the area			
2580	around Tshletshy (or Bob Creek) is going			
2581	to look as hammered as that campsite at Spruce Bottom is now.			
2582				
2583	Why'd they yank out the sign at the lower crossing junction at 4.2			
2584	miles? Who did that? Put that sign back. Unless you've			
2585	you've been hiking that trail for years, there is NO way to discern			
2586	where that trail junction is. People up there have NO			
2587	clue where they are. (Last party I talked to camped there at the site			
2588	down on the bench at 4.2 miles, and thought they			
2589	were "about 3 miles up the trail".			
2590				
2591	Fly in a crew with a helicopter to Smith Place. Get as much of that			
2592	glass and metal picked up and cleaned up, and torch			
2593	the remains of that old Shaube cabin. The structure has collapsed, and			
2594	people are already picking it apart piece by piece			
2595	for firewood (or worse: to build furniture along the riverbank.)			
2596	I've found pieces of the old wood-stove 2 miles upriver.)			
2597				
2598	5. Last item: ROADS.			
2599	Okay guys, I'll be blunt: This idea of closing roads in National Parks			
2600	has got to stop. I don't know where this idea came			
2601	from, but it's just plain stupid. William J. Briggles did everything he			
2602	could possibly do to get the Carbon River Road up at			
2603	MRNP closed permanently, and the public said NO WAY. Briggles' retired			
2604	now, fortunately. Anybody else workin' for			
2605	NPS who thinks roads should be closed needs to retire as well, or be			
2606	fired. In my view, people who support the idea			
2607	of closing roads in National Parks are NOT working in the public's best			
2608	interests, and have no business being part of			
2609	any decision-making process on public lands. There ain't that many roads			
2610	anyway: keep those few you have now			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2611	opened and maintained, and find something else to do with your time			
2612	besides trying to devise means to close them.			
2613	Am I clear enough on that point?			
2614				
2615	Okay, so there's my rant.			
2616				
2617	188547	individual	Seattle	WA
2618	I prefer Alternative B. Emphasis should be on protecting what is there (and restoring what has been damaged).			
2619	190898		Port Townsend	WA
	I prefer management plan Alternative A. My concerns and comments pertain to Ozette National Park in particular. Headquarters at Ozette, the campground, beach trails, wilderness camping at the beach, and Ericson Bay make up most of the visitor interest. Locals enjoy Swan Bay. Without motor boats, even less of the lake can be seen and enjoyed. Acquiring more timber lands hamper recreational use of resources. Timber companies have strict guidelines to protect streams and rivers.			
2620				
2621	190678	Park Inholder	Port Orchard	WA
2622	Plan for more people, plan for budget restraints.			
	Ozette: Keep Rayonier Landing open for families of small kids to play. This is the only picnic area on the lake. The campground is for camping, and fills up quickly. Families need a place to let the kids out, they need lakeside access. Swimming access.			
2623				
2624				
2625	Continue to allow boat access. This access will be self limiting as gas gets more expensive.			
2626	After land has been logged & replanted, it is cheaper to acquire. Acquire land for salmon preservation.			
2627	Land acquisition will "sop up" winter high water problem.			
2628				
2629	Cell tower for Ocean goes safety concerns. Safety is a valid concern.			
2630				
2631	Reestablish trail and Allen's Bay.			
2632	Ozette River is a drainage river, not a spawning river. Spawning occurs in Lake tributaries (page 116 is incorrect look at the map.)			
2633	189369		Portland	OR
2634	Additional text at beginning of letter:			
2635				
2636	As a resident of the beautiful Pacific Northwest, I urge that we			
2637	work to preserve and enjoy the resources we are so lucky to			
2638	have.			
2639	190908		Woodbridg e	VA
	Please consider our comments on the draft General Management Plan for Olympic National Park, Washington. I am retired from the military. I was in your area often during my official travels in the United States Air Force. One of my old Air Force colleagues, who worked at Olympic National Park, alerted me to this plan.			
2640				
2641				
	Some provisions of your Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) are good, but others should be rewritten. Alternative D is on the right track in proposing "intertidal zones" to protect marine life along the Olympic Coast and in proposing optional public transportaion to relieve traffic jams at Hurricane Ridge, Hoh River rain forest, and Sol Duc hot springs.			
2642				
2643				
	The greatest disservice Alterantive D does to Olympic National Park is its overemphasis on development. It enlarges the "development zones" at Hurricane Ridge, Elwha River, and Sol Duc hot springs, contemplating a three-fold expansion of commercial concessions and campgrounds. That should be rejected, and the areas should be kept in a natural state as in Alternative A. These are among the most easily accessible areas of the park, and the most popular. People go there to find unspoiled nature, not developments.			
2644				
2645				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2646	We urge you to drop the notion of repairing and rehabbing dozens of old shelters and cabins in wilderness areas of the park, as proposed in Alternative D. Our firend has seen some of these structures first hand. Many are the ramshackle remnants of settlement before the park was established. First, you should develop a wilderness stewardship plan that analyzes the impact of these old buildings on wilderness values and answers the question, "Are these structures still needed?" Most wilderness areas are free of structures. Is there any reason why Olympic National Park should be different?			
2647				
2648	Thank you for considering our views. We hope the National Park Service will make a wise decision that will protect this national park unspoiled for future generations.			
2649	191221		Port	WA
2650	Letter on file		Townsend	
2651	190892	self	Port	WA
2652	Attention Plan Administrators:		Angeles	
2653				
2654	The following are my comments on the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan (GMP) dated May 2006. I attended the ONP Port Angeles open house and have studied the alternatives covered in the Draft GMP document.			
2655				
2656	The planning document is long but easy to read. It is worded such that regardless of the comments received, the NPS and ONP management have license to do as they please. In fact the ONP Superintendent told me personally that neither he nor NPS is interested in a public meeting format to solicit comments on the GMP. Therefore these comments and those from others that are not in lock step agreement with NPS and ONP management views may have little impact on the GMP.			
2657				
2658	Alternative A is the only one I can support. The other alternatives while having some appealing points have too much negative baggage for my support. The following areas of the GMP are of specific concern and need to be changed:			
2659	" The document has too many general statements concerning negative impacts of logging and related activities on fish habitat destruction. This is only a supposition or theory not based upon site specific research. Past logging practices may have impacted some streams but most have not. No evidence is presented on specific damage that has occurred in ONP from logging. Site specific studies in Alaska show that siltation and stream damage from road building and logging normally disappear in one year. Modern logging practices do not adversely impact fisheries to any significant extent. Modern logging practices and approved timber management plans should be recognized as part of a forward looking document such as the GMP.			
2660	" The GMP conveniently ignores over fishing by the indigenous tribes as one of the major reasons for the decline of fisheries on the Olympic Peninsula. I know it is politically unpopular and easier to blame logging and other whipping boys but poor tribal fisheries management should be mentioned and have a plan for correction.			
2661	" Boundary line adjustments for increasing land under jurisdiction and subsequent control of ONP should be excluded. They are not necessary to fulfill the park's mission, purpose and significance as stated in item 1 on page 42. Site specific evidence has not been included to justify boundary line adjustments for the Lake Crescent, Lake Ozette, Queets, Quinault, and Hoh areas. These adjustments are not necessary nor are they supported by unbiased site specific research or studies that normally precede research.			
2662	" Private timber land purchases mentioned for boundary line adjustments are stated to be between willing buyer and willing seller as noted on pages 34, 35 and 369. Purchases of other lands within ONP are not clearly stated to be between willing buyer and willing seller.			
2663	" Property inholders within ONP are not mentioned in the GMP except to state some properties are not consistent with park goals. The conclusion on page 211 states "some non historic structures may be removed." Does this mean inholders are planned to be excluded? Will the willing buyer willing seller plan currently in use for acquiring inholder properties be part of the GMP? This part of the plan should be modified to clearly include inholders as part of the willing buyer willing seller policy.			
2664	" The management zone concept on page 57 describes 3 wilderness zones. This is unnecessary. Wilderness is wilderness. The attempt to classify this into the wilderness trail zone, primitive wilderness zone and primeval wilderness zone appears to be a veiled attempt to administratively change the definition of wilderness as defined in the federal act with the intention of gradually making the back country less available to the public. The subsequent use of wilderness zones in the various alternatives to restrict public access is in direct opposition to the purpose and mission of ONP. It also is in conflict with the 1938 ONP enabling language.			
2665	" Alternatives A, C and D allow the ski area to remain at Hurricane Ridge. While Alternative A on page 216 allows operation of the downhill ski facilities there would be no expansion even to handle normal growth. This is unnecessary and a direct insult to the winter sports enthusiasts from the Olympic Peninsula that regularly use as well as financially support the facility. The wording of Alternative C on page 293 for snow-based recreational opportunities should be used to replace related relevant wording in both Alternatives A and D.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2666	" Comments on Park Staffing and Budget, page 231, are improper and imply that ONP does not have enough funds to continue normal operations in the future. This is stated even though the facts show the NPS and ONP have received increased funding each year for at least the last 5 years. The problem is with how ONP chooses to spend its money. Like with any business that has a budget the park management must make good choices on what to fund and what to exclude. ONP has not made good choices in many areas and therefore cites lack of funds for non-performance. I would be happy to provide a list of specific examples, but do not feel this should be part of my comments on the GMP unless specifically requested. Suffice it to say ONP continues to fund marginal projects while ignoring those that that are needed but have high public visibility, thereby giving credibility to the mantra that ONP does not have adequate funding.			
2667	" The real reason for adding land to ONP from boundary adjustments surfaces when one looks at the comments on FTEs as related to future budget needs. By adding land, converting more of it to wilderness thereby reducing visitor servicing requirements, ONP can justify a larger number of FTEs and a larger future budget. As a taxpayer and local resident I find this unacceptable. The boundary adjustments from the various alternatives allow 15,940 acres to be added to ONP and 44,000 acres to be purchased and exchanged with Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) which will remove 59,940 acres from the local property tax rolls. This will create an excessive burden on the local tax base where 80+% of the land mass is already not on the tax rolls due to the combined effect of federal, state, tribal and local government ownership. The result: a substantial negative economic impact on local residents. The notion that federal PILT (payment in lieu of taxes) funds will make up the difference is patently false. Review of past history shows that PILT reimbursement funding is unreasonably low.			
2668				
2669	" The 44,000 acres of private timber land that is to be exchanged for mineral rights in ONP is absolutely unnecessary. The likelihood of any private entity performing mineral or oil exploration in ONP is laughable. The environmental community along with the NPS would establish legal hurdles that would be nearly financially impossible to overcome.			
2670	" The use 44,000 acres to establish a Legacy Forest has a nice sound to it, but when one examines what is required of a Legacy Forest, it essentially locks up more land from future timber production and converts it to near wilderness. It also does not properly recognize the good job local timber companies are doing in managing their forests. By virtually all measures it is well recognized that private timber companies do a better job than the government when it come to forestry practices.			
2671	" I could not specifically find mentions of the goats in GMP unless they are considered exotic species. The goats occupy only a small area of the park and are not a problem for native vegetation. As an avid hiker I see more damage from avalanches and rock falls than from goats except in limited areas. Past measures to remove goats have been a failure and have caused a loud local public outcry against the process. This has added to the jaded opinion of the park held by many local residents.			
2672	" The GMP lacks any serious consideration of the energy impact from the various alternatives. Furthermore it touts removal of the two Elwha dams as having long term benefits. This depends upon the point of view. According to the 1994 Elwha Environmental Impact Statement the two dams annually generate 172,000 MWH of electric power with a current market value of \$10.3 million. It is most likely that this power lost by dam removal will be replaced by power generated by traditional steam turbines using fossil fuels such as coal, gas or oil. Engineering calculations show it would require burning 204 tons/day of medium grade coal such as is used at the nearby Centralia power plant. This would generate 2,788 tons/day of stack gases of which 473 tons/day would be carbon dioxide. This is equivalent to 20,200 cars on the highway. The environmental results would not be in our back yard but should be recognized in the GMP. Considering the environmental significance of dam removal it should be put on hold until an independent scientific study can be made of alternatives, a study unburdened by politics. This study should be included as part of the GMP.			
2673				
2674	In order to give a better perspective of the basis for my comments I have included a few words about my background and involvement with ONP and the local community. I am a 32 year resident of Port Angeles, member of the Board of Directors of Friends of Olympic National Park, a property inholder in the Park, director of a local bank, chemical engineer and former Fulbright scholar. I was actively involved with the Elwha Dam relicensing issues as the resident manager of the then Crown Zellerbach Mill (now Nippon). I also served on the Elwha Citizens' Advisory Committee which prepared the Community Report for resolution of the controversy surrounding implementation of the Elwha Restoration Act. This report was submitted to our Congressional delegation and is part of the Record. As an avid hiker I spend about 50 days per year hiking in the Park.			
2675				
2676	191216		Bothell	WA
2677	We are writing to comment on the proposals to change/improve the management plan for Olympic National Park in Washington State. This park, as you know, is one of the few intact ecosystems remaining in the U.S. and our thoughts are that the main goal of any management plan be that this ecosystem should be maintained and improved, if possible. Plan D, it seems, focuses too heavily on commercial developement or access as opposed to protection of rivers and watersheds. We are appreciative that the establishment of intertidal reserves has been recommended, but would like to see Wild and Scenic River status designations and a comprehensive wilderness management plan. We go to the park for its peacefulness. We love the Mt. Rainier areas and facilities but would never want to see the Olympic Park impacted and (we're afraid to say) overrun like Rainier is. 250 campsites at Sol Duc? Too big! Please protect the ecology and the peace of this special place.			
2678	187974		Madras	OR

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2679	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the			
2680	Olympic National Park Draft General Management			
2681	Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft GMP/EIS) After looking at the documentation I think you should implement Alternative C.			
2682	We need to encourage more people to see and use the Park.			
2683				
2684	I do not understand why there are three wilderness zones. As far as I can read there is only one Wilderness act and that is the only one you should be following.			
2685	190220		Olympia	WA
2686	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Park's Draft General Management Plan. The draft Plan contains a wealth of information about the Park, a solid set of well-written analysis, and an exciting list of opportunities available to the Park Service for preserving and enhancing the Park and its value to the environment and the country's citizens.			
2687				
2688	My interest in the Park and its plans is motivated by decades of hiking, camping, and climbing in the Olympics. It is my favorite place in the state for enjoying the outdoors and its wildlife. It truly is "unmatched in the world."			
2689				
2690	My comments will focus on the balance selected for the Preferred Alternative D, between the cultural and natural resource protection emphasized in Alternative B and the increased visitor access emphasized in Alternative C. I believe that the balance selected shortchanges natural resource protection, misses important opportunities to enhance those protections, leans far too heavily toward visitor access and development within the Park, and does a poor job of explaining the process behind and reasons for those choices.			
2691				
2692	Boundary Expansions			
2693				
2694	Boundary Expansions were proposed in Alternative B in "five critical areas (Lake Crescent and Ozette Lake, and Hoh, Queets, and Quinault watersheds) to conform with watershed basins to help recovering salmon populations and protect critical elk habitat."			
2695				
2696	The first missed opportunity in the Preferred Alternative D is the severe reduction in boundary expansions described in Alternative B and chosen for the Preferred Alternative. Some of the boundary expansions in Alt. D are even smaller than those described in the development-oriented Alt. C. It is hard to understand why the planners restricted the recommended boundary adjustments to such a degree there is no discussion of the trade-offs or reasoning behind the selections for Alt. D.			
2697				
2698	The expansion proposed in Alt. B for the outlet of Lake Crescent and almost the entire watershed of its other major tributary, Boundary Creek, is reduced, in Alt. D, to a small area of the Lyre River around the outlet of the lake, removing the protection of Boundary Creek. The Ozette Lake expansion in Alt. B, which includes the major portion of the area that drains into the lake, is reduced, in Alt. D, to a narrow strip around the lake which bears no relation to the watershed boundaries. The Queets River expansion in Alt. B, which includes the all of the land north of the river to the top of the ridge, is reduced to a small, arbitrary segment well down the river. The Hoh River expansion in Alt. B, which would include much of the South Fork watershed, and the Quinault River expansion, which would add a good strip of land along the south shore of the river from Lake Quinault to the Park boundary, both simply disappear in the Preferred Alternative.			
2699				
2700	Boundary expansions can be expensive, of course, but they do not have negative impacts on visitor access, like some of the other elements in Alt. B. Maintaining the boundary expansions described in Alt. B is an excellent way to maintain a balance between resource protection and visitor access, considering the dramatic increase in development areas within the Park, as proposed in Alt. D.			
2701				
2702	River Zones			
2703				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2704	Several of the Park's roads and facilities lie in the floodplains of salmon-bearing rivers. Alternative B suggests a "river zone" for the Quinault, Hoh, and Queets Rivers. In the words of the draft Plan, this would mean that the "range of management actions that might be undertaken to address changes in resource conditions include removing facilities or roads, closing and rehabilitating unwanted trails, closing areas seasonally, removing invasive plants and revegetating using native plants, and expanding educational programs." This could mean allowing natural river meander changes to break roads and trails and subsequently moving roads and facilities out of the floodplain.			
2705				
2706	These kinds of measures create an opportunity for greatly improving the health of these important rivers and their lowland habitat. Obviously, moving roads and facilities could incur significant costs. And they could I emphasize "could" affect visitor access, at least temporarily.			
2707				
2708	Even so, the planners should reconsider adding the river zones to the Preferred Alternative, especially on the Queets and Quinault Rivers. The zones on those two rivers seem to carry higher benefit to cost ratios, considering where on the river they occur, the facilities that they might affect, and the area that they protect. This change would effect a significant and necessary change in the balance of natural resource protection and visitor access.			
2709				
2710	Development Zones			
2711				
2712	One of the alarming elements of the Preferred Alternative D is the selection of every "development zones" suggested in Alt. C. In one case, the Hoh area, Alt. D includes even more area than suggested in Alt. C. This is an example of a serious step out of balance in the draft Plan.			
2713				
2714	Now, I like the developed areas found in the Park today. I use the running water and flush toilets, the interpretive structures, and the park operational facilities, as well as, of course, the roads and trails. Still, I question the dramatic expansion in the development zone area in certain places in the Park. Two factors support this question.			
2715				
2716	The first is this quote from the draft Plan, which suggests that most facilities will continue to function well:			
2717	"Most existing facilities provide good visitor opportunities and, based on projected trends, will continue to function well&Certain frontcountry visitor centers are extremely crowded during the summer season, and the displays are outdated."			
2718	I may have missed it, but I didn't see a description of problems with the facilities, other than that one mention of crowding, which would be in August, according to the visitation data provided in the draft Plan.			
2719				
2720	The other factor comes from the visitation data provided in the draft Plan. Although the last fifteen years of data suggests a slow growth in visitation, up to 4 million visits over the next ten years (from just over 3 million 2004, the last year reported in the draft Plan), the last twelve years show a flat visitation trend, running at about 3.4 million annual visits. This doesn't suggest the need for a dramatic increase in development in the Park and calls into question the need for the proposed dramatic increase in the development zone. The planners should reconsider the selection of development zones in the plan, in order to promote a better balance between development and natural resource protection.			
2721				
2722	Conclusion			
2723				
2724	The draft Plan contains excellent information about the Park, clear descriptions of opportunities for fulfilling the goals of the Park Service and the enabling legislation for the Olympic National Park, and a set of choices in the Preferred Alternative D that should be reconsidered, in an effort to create a more balanced Plan, one that expands the opportunities for natural resource protection and reduces some of the expansion of visitor capability, to bring them more into line with each other.			
2725				
2726	The boundary extensions suggested in Alternative B should be restored to the Preferred Alternative. These extensions offer the most effective means to protect watersheds and habitat available to the Park, at no cost to visitor access. The river zones, especially on the Queets and Quinault Rivers should be reconsidered for the Preferred Alternative, as an important means for repairing some of the damage done by previous settlement and park development, especially considering the increasing value placed on dwindling wild salmon runs. Finally, the dramatic extensions of the development zone in the Preferred Alternative should be reconsidered, because of the impacts these might bring to the protection of the Park's natural resources and in light of the ambivalent nature of the information available about the demand for these developed areas.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2727	Thank you, once again, for considering my comments on this important planning effort. I look forward to reading the final Plan and seeing it put into action over the next decades.			
2728				
2729	190537 I grew up in Hoodspout, WA. The Olympics were my backyard. I now live in Ocean Shores, WA. They are again my backyard. We must protect this area and leave it as natural and undisturbed by humans as possible. As a Tacoma Mountaineer, I make sure I stay on the path, except the one time a cow elk tried to bite me. As I was waving my hands to try and get her to move off the path, her upper lip curled inward showing me her big white teeth. Then she moved her head towards me. I then stepped behind a tree and gave her the path. It was my fault for trying to wave her off the path. She didn't want to go. She was bigger than I with bigger teeth. As soon as I stepped off the path, she walked by with her head held high. No doubt to make sure I still could see her teeth!		Ocean Shores	WA
2730				
2731	The Olympics are her home. I was a visitor, yet I have the power to try and protect her and her home. You do have the power to protect all the animals and their homes. Please take this responsibility seriously. Don't let money and/or power cloud your responsibility.			
2732				
2733	191023 The National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS) submits this letter of comment on the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan (GMP). NOLS is a non-profit educational organization, teaching backcountry wilderness skills and leadership to students of all ages from five locations in the U.S. and four international schools. In the U.S., we are a fully permitted, fee-paying operator on public lands. Holding 21 separate permits to teach students in national parks, we have a keen interest in the future of park system management and a solid foundation of experience from which to provide comment.	NOLS Pacific Northwest	Conway	WA
2734				
2735	NOLS appreciates the opportunity to provide input on the draft plan. Overall we believe the preferred alternative provides an excellent balance between natural resource protection and improving visitor access.			
2736				
2737	" NOLS is pleased overall that the GMP designates 3 wilderness zones, the majority of wilderness being designated as primeval. The zone designations are appropriate, and lay a foundation for the WMP. The details of how these areas end up managed under the WMP will be critical.			
2738				
2739	" NOLS is pleased that under the preferred alternative, 35% of the Park's coastal strip would be designated as intertidal reserves. Protection of these intertidal zones is critical to the health of the coastal ecosystem. Permit limits, especially in high use seasons, and designated trailways would be appropriate future steps as part of the GMP or WMP processes.			
2740				
2741	" NOLS is pleased that the GMP increases universal access and front country opportunities, including a greater emphasis on educational and interpretive programs. Improved and expanded visitor facilities will also greatly assist in this effort, and help improve the experience of the vast majority of the visitors who do not travel far from their vehicle. Improving their experience, and their knowledge of the Park, will help create more stewards and proponents for the Park's future. We trust that when visitor facilities are developed or improved, those buildings will be built in as sustainable a manner as possible.			
2742				
2743	" NOLS is very supportive of an increased focus on mass transit to reduce vehicle use in some areas, especially Hurricane Ridge. NOLS also supports the maintenance of existing road access to the Park. The GMP should ensure that trail access is maintained for a variety of user groups, and there should be no net loss of trail access to any group including hikers and stock. Stock use on Wilderness trails, where appropriate, should remain open to all stock users, not just to special permitted Park Service approved pack strings or saddle horses.			
2744				
2745				
2746	Our concerns:			
2747				
2748	" The draft GMP is not explicit about how it will tie in with the long delayed Olympic National Park Wilderness Management Plan. Given the fact that Olympic National Park is 95% designated wilderness, the details of how the two plans will work together is critical. The WMP must follow in a timely manner.			
2749				
2750	" The GMP mentions that wilderness campsites will generally remain the same, though some may be relocated, modified or restored. The GMP goes on to explain that some wilderness areas of the Park may have limits established on numbers of campers. NOLS understands that some limits may need to be placed on overall numbers of campers in certain areas in order to protect resources, but we would be concerned if that was done through limiting group sizes below the current level of 12.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2751	" The GMP mandates the protection of all historical and cultural properties in wilderness without evaluating the impact on wilderness character. Historic shelters have been allowed to fall into disrepair. Many are on eyesore. Given the budget challenges the Park continues to face, NOLS recommends that many of these wilderness based structures be removed rather than spend money trying in maintenance.			
2752				
2753				
2754	We appreciate the opportunity to share our views and look forward to continuing to work with the NPS to introduce the public to a superlative park. We hope that our input is helpful. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me.			
2755				
2756	188704		ventura	CA
2757	To whom it may concern, Olympic Hot Springs are on public property own by the people the people have been using these springs long before the US Forest Diservice has been in control.			
2758	190714		Port Townsend	WA
2759	To Whom It May Concern:			
2760				
2761	Please do not touch our beloved Olympic Hot Spring Campground and Pools. We are lifelong WA residents whom have enjoyed the wonderful experience of this precious area. I am looking forward to taking my grandson on his first hiking experience at this location. Olympic Hot Springs area is cherished and respected by the few lucky people whom utilize this area.			
2762	188327		Port Townsend	WA
2763	Please do not touch our beloved Olympic Hot Springs Campground and pools. We are life long WA residents whom have enjoyed the wonderful experience of this precious area. I am looking forward to taking my grandson on his first hiking experience at this location. Olympic Hot Springs area is cherished and respected by the few lucky people whom utilize this area.			
2764	190560		None Provided	N/A
2765	A couple of issues that need to be addressed are better access to Hurricane Ridge and Deer Park during the winter months. The Deer Park Road needs to be opened back up to within two miles of the top as it was in the past for having access for Nordic and Telemark skiing and winter camping.			
2766				
2767	Hurricane Ridge Road needs to be opened Friday through Sunday with the road crew working on the road on an as needed basis earlier the week to be able to stay ahead of the snow accumulation as opposed to starting plowing on Thursday and not being able to open the road on time or at all for the weekend. The road should have an opening time of 08:00 on Friday through Sunday.			
2768				
2769	The Downhill Skiing facilities need to be upgraded to a chairlift. This would be a safety and handicap person upgrade that would allow them access to more terrain during the summer and winter seasons.			
2770	190651	Lazelle Nature Photography	Quilcene	WA
2771	PLEASE defer all decisions relating to wilderness until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed and available for public review.			
2772				
2773	PLEASE keep developed areas at their current size as described in alternative A. New developments should remain OUTSIDE the national park.			
2774				
2775	PLEASE restore species like the wolf and fisher.			
2776				
2777	PLEASE establish river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural river processes as proposed in Alternative B and design all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild & Scenic river designation.			
2778				
2779	PLEASE expand park boundaries in five areas - Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, Hoh, Queets and Quinault watersheds) to protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife as proposed in Alternative B.			
2780				
2781	Olympic National Park's HIGHEST PRIORITY should be preserving its natural systems, restoring threatened wildlife and protecting the integrity of its world-class wilderness.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2782				
2783	Thank you for reviewing my comment. I would like to also take time to thank you for establishing intertidal reserves on the Olympic Coast and recommending wilderness study for Ozette Lake!			
2784				
2785	190533		None Provided	N/A
2786	Please consider further support for Alternative C. The taxpaying public expects access to facilities they pay for. The majority are not content to continue to pay for no more than "the warm & fuzzy feeling that it is there". You cannot continue to garner support for something the public does not have access to or can never see for themselves. Visitor services and development is important to maintain both public support and budget to achieve the desired goals.			
2787				
2788	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Park General Management Plan Draft EIS.			
2789	190829	Hoh Indian Tribe	Forks	WA
2790	Letter on File			
2791				
2792	191225	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, Grays Harbor Chapter	Elma	WA
2793	Please keep stock trails in the ONP to at least the current miles. More if possible! The more miles there are and the safer the trails, the less traffic,conjestion, conflict there will be as folks can disperse themselves.			
2794				
2795	As Americans "grey" (boomers), more an dmore ar efinding that they can get around a lot easier on horses and mules than they on aging knees and joints. Please don't shut down access for these people.			
2796				
2797	And the more stock trails there are, the easier it is to maintain a large majority of all trails as pace stock can be used to provide manpower and supplies.			
2798				
2799	As a resident of Grays Harbor on the Olympic Peninsula, I can see the population growing by leaps and bounds. Many come for the recreation opportunities. Please consider facilities and trails for the increasing numbers of people wanting to use the awesome, beautiful Olympic National Park on horses and mules.			
2800	190995	National Coast Trail Association	Portland	OR
2801	Comments Consistent with National Park Service Mission			
2802	The Organic Act of August 25, 1916, states that the (National Park) Service . . . shall promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks, monuments and reservations . . . to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."It is further noted on the official National Park Service website in their "Mission" section that "The National Park Service still strives to meet those original goals, while filling many other roles as well: guardian of our diverse cultural and recreational resources; environmental advocate; world leader in the parks and preservation community; and pioneer in the drive to protect America's open space." Therefore, this letter represents the National Coast Trails Association's comments and input on the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for Olympic National Park that we believe is consistent with the stated mission and roles of the National Park Service. The comments provided focus on our organization's goals of trail development, enhancement, management and maintenance; and the protection of land and sea within the trail corridor relative to both the "Olympic Coastal Strip" portion of the "Washington Coast Trail" and the developing "Olympic Discovery Trail" within and adjacent to the boundaries of Olympic National Park.			
2803				
2804				
2805	Vision and Relevant Goals of the National Coast Trail Association			
2806	The National Coast Trail Association's vision is the "National Coast Trail," a land and water-based trail system around the United States providing non-motorized recreational opportunities to experience the natural, historic and cultural resources along its length. Our priority goal focuses on America's 1,800-mile "West Coast Trail," a hiking trail from Cape Flattery, WA to the Mexican border in California. The "Washington Coast Trail" represents the northern 200-mile section of the West Coast Trail, and the Olympic Coastal Strip a very important segment through Olympic National Park. Also, the Olympic Discovery Trail, another important segment through the park and also the western terminus of the "Pacific Northwest Trail," represents the western end along the entire northern route section of the National Coast Trail vision from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.			
2807				
2808	Support Alternative "D" But Modify to Emphasize Resource Protection			
2809	For Olympic Coastal Strip and Lake Crescent			

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
2810		The National Coast Trail Association supports "Alternative D," the National Park Service's preferred alternative with a general management emphasis both on protecting resources and improving visitor experiences. However, in relation to the relatively narrow, isolated and unique coastal wilderness lands of the park's "Olympic Coastal Strip" and the lands north of Lake Crescent we propose that future park management should emphasize natural resource protection, and the preferred alternative modified accordingly.			
2811					
2812	Boundary Adjustments				
2813	Ozette				
2814		The trails, beaches and rocky shoreline along the Olympic Coastal Strip from the northern boundary of the park with the Makah Indian Nation to the southern boundary of the park north of the Queets River represents a significant section of the Washington Coast Trail. Important spur trails from the coast are those that take the hiker inland to Ozette Lake. Therefore, in order to begin to enhance opportunities for public enjoyment for those using these spur trails to the Ozette area, we note that the boundary adjustments proposed under both alternative C with a visitor opportunities emphasis south to Bristol Point and alternative D south beyond Bristol point at the very minimum should be included in the final GMP. However, given the relatively narrow area of the entire Olympic Coastal Strip and its unique significance as true coastal wilderness it would seem both apparent and appropriate that the value of boundary adjustments which provide at least one much larger area of protected habitat along the coast could not only increase the population of resident species but extirpated species could either re-establish themselves or be reintroduce with success.			
2815		The rationale being that protection of a much larger area could potentially provide trail users a greater opportunity to experience wildlife both along the immediate coast and the lake plus protect the viewshed up to the surrounding ridges around the lake. Finally, therefore, we propose that both visitors and resource protection values are best achieved by including the resource protection emphasis of alternative B for boundary adjustments in the Ozette Lake area.			
2816	Lake Crescent				
2817		A segment of the Olympic Discovery Trail not only utilizes the Spruce Railroad Trail along the northern edge of the lake, but also has a spur route coming from the north along the eastern side of the Lyre River. Therefore, in order to enhance opportunities for public enjoyment for those using the trail in this area, we propose not only that the boundary adjustments proposed under alternative "B" with a resource protection emphasis be included in the final GMP but also extended west to include all existing US Forest Service lands in Olympic National Forest to the existing north-south ONP boundary about 1-2 miles west of Fairholme Campground. The rationale being that protection of this area could potentially provide trail users a greater opportunity to experience both land-based and aquatic wildlife and protect the viewshed along the crest of the mountain ridge just north of the lake not only through additional habitat and potentially a migratory corridor, but also by protecting the Lyre River watershed.			
2818					
2819	Olympic Coastal Strip				
2820		Given what we've already stated, especially above relative to the Ozette area, we also propose that boundary adjustments are made that would essentially be expanded east in sections of the strip where present boundaries are less than 1-mile wide. The goal would be to establish at least a 1-mile wide corridor to enhance wildlife habitat and migratory corridors, thereby enhancing opportunities for enjoyment by trail users for increased wildlife viewing along the entire coastal strip.			
2821					
2822	Second Beach Trail				
2823		Given the current situation of closure of the trail to "Second Beach" by the Quilleute Tribe, we would propose resolving the issue to provide public access along this trail to the coast. We realize this is an issue that needs to be resolved by both the National Park Service and the Quilleute Tribe, however, one solution relative to boundary adjustments, that we simply as one potential option would be to explore the possibility, and only if the tribe is willing, of considering a trail easement, and hopefully in perpetuity. Once again, we are only offering this as potential solution for consideration by those parties involved, and hope for future cooperation and consensus between the tribe and the park to resolve the existing access issue to the beach.			
2824					
2825	Natural Resources				
2826		Given the rationale, goals and values already expressed relative to the proposed boundary adjustments above for Ozette, Lake Crescent and the Olympic Coastal Strip as a whole, we propose that a primary objective for Olympic National Park would be to essentially restore natural ecological processes to systems altered by humans. This would include both the areas within their current boundaries and beyond as extended boundary adjustments are realized.			
2827					
2828	Cultural Resources				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2829	Given any specific cultural resource questions involving its proper care and how it should be managed in wilderness areas might best be answered by a process that allows key stakeholders, park staff and even visitors first determine its significance, and then consider and craft a management solution for each one. What could be called the mission of the NPS "to conserve . . . and to provide for the enjoyment" of these and other resources suggests the desired goal for any specific cultural resource. Since the National Coast Trail Association values cooperation and consensus, we therefore propose that a cooperative process involving public and staff be developed and implemented to first determine the significance of any cultural resource, and then to reach a consensus as to how to manage each one to conserve and provide for its enjoyment. Finally, in cases where the objective to conserve a significant cultural is in conflict with providing for its enjoyment, we propose that the primary goal should then become resource protection, i.e., that general public access would not be encouraged or allowed.			
2830				
2831	Tribal Relations			
2832	One primary way the National Park Service could work with the tribes to improve cooperation and coordination and achieve other goals would be to develop and always maintain a working relationship of mutual trust and respect. One initial strategy could simply be to ask tribal leaders for their input about how they think the park could better work with them when providing for visitor opportunities and protecting resources are mutually-shared goals or at least not in conflict with tribal values and goals. Our comments here simply reflect our approach of working cooperatively with others to achieve mutual goals, and although not offered as specific proposals, are given for both NPS and tribal consideration.			
2833				
2834	Partnerships			
2835	We propose that what has already been stated relative to both cultural resources in terms of developing a cooperative process and in general to tribal relations could be adapted and applied to develop and work effectively in terms of partnerships for the protection and visitor enjoyment of park resources. The extent to which the park could develop partnerships could potentially range from a simply expressed willingness to a formal written agreement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, or even entering into a legal document, to work with the park. Once again, it would seem crucial that partners would either have mutually-shared or complementary goals to maintain a successful partnership. Regarding the Olympic Discovery Trail we would propose the park initiate and cultivate a relationship with the Peninsula Trails Coalition.			
2836				
2837	Wilderness			
2838	We have already addressed what we feel are the appropriate boundary adjustments in order to fulfill the park's mission, purpose and significance and will therefore focus on what experiences, resource conditions and facilities are consistent with wilderness values. Our focus here will be the Washington Coast Trail along the Olympic Coastal Strip with a brief comment on the section of the Olympic Discovery Trail just north and along Lake Crescent.			
2839				
2840	Washington Coast Trail			
2841	Facilities along the Olympic Coastal Strip should primarily focus on the goals of minimizing overall impact, and providing for sanitation and emergency survival. Given the popular usage of the Olympic Coastal Strip by hikers and backpackers especially during the summer months we propose providing simple enclosed structures for solid human waste disposal in appropriately spaced locations and consistent with the protection of wilderness and resource protection values. Given the potential for developing hypothermia from exposure even during the summer season and the potential for heavy rains and high winds we would propose simple elevated emergency shelters with a roof and three walls be installed in appropriately spaced locations and consistent with the protection of wilderness and resource protection values.			
2842	Experiences for the hiker and overnight backpacker along the Olympic Coastal Strip should simply be that of the unique coastal wilderness found there. Defining what the "Olympic wilderness coastal experience" is and how it can be protected, enhanced and restored should be primary goals. However the wilderness coastal experience is defined, it always needs to remain the guiding principle for future management actions. Essential components of this definition would include being able to experience the sights, sounds, and smells, and potentially even the tastes and tactile sensations associated with coastal wilderness. Visually this would include both plant and animal wildlife in terms of both landscapes and seascapes out as far as the immediate horizon -- through the protection, enhancement and restoration of the coastal wilderness viewshed. Two examples, Ocean Power Technologies is a US firm developing a "PowerBuoy" that floats offshore to extract energy from ocean waves, and inland cell towers could be proposed. Under the proposed "coastal wilderness policy" to avoid their visual impact, their installation along the Olympic Coast Strip would simply not be allowed.			
2843	This policy would also include the value of both natural soundscapes and lightsapes. The answer as to how wilderness could be protected, enhanced and restored has already been stated earlier in this letter.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2844	Resource conditions along the Olympic Coastal Strip have already been addressed earlier in this letter and focus on achieving the primary goal of both protecting the existing coastal wilderness ecosystem and restoring it, especially where disturbed by human activities. However, as a final but significant comment regarding the restoration and viability of the existing wilderness ecosystem immediately along the coast we offer the following proposal for the park's consideration. Since the coastal strip is a relatively small protected area the survival of wildlife and other biodiversity are potentially at risk because these areas could be too small to adequately support viable species populations and the ecosystem they need. Therefore, perhaps one management strategy would be to work with the US Forest Service and corporate timber managers to negotiate protected migratory corridors, for example,			
2845	not generally not allowing general vehicle access, logging, or hunting within their boundaries, such that species are able to safely migrate unimpeded to and from park boundaries of the coast and those further inland. These migratory corridors could actually be relocated as needed through a flexible and adaptive approach that would allow timber managers to manage their resources for their purposes while at the same time meeting the resource protection mission and goals of the National Park Service.			
2846	Olympic Discovery Trail			
2847	Where the Olympic Discovery Trail enters existing park lands and potential new areas via the boundary adjustments, natural resource protections and enhancements we have already proposed for the Lake Crescent area, we simply propose, given surrounding impacts, that the resource conditions should aim at providing trail users with as much of a wilderness experience as possible where the trail enters north of the lake and then west along the shore.			
2848	Visitor Experiences			
2849	The "coastal wilderness policy" we already proposed above essentially considers what we would define as a high-quality visitor experience for hikers and overnight backpackers, however other primary questions in this area remain to be answered. Regarding increased visitation while maintaining quality visitor experiences and preserving resources for the Olympic Coastal Strip, we propose the NPS consider the current approach used by Parks Canada in Pacific Rim National Park along one 45-mile section of their coastal strip called the "West Coast Trail" (not to be confused with America's 1,800-mile trail with the exact name.) The Parks Canada approach uses a quota system, an orientation session addressing issues such as minimum impact techniques, for example, the "tidal flush" method of disposing of solid human waste, and a reservation system during the peak season that allows one to reserve 2 months in advance. Ranger-led interpretive hikes about natural and cultural resources and history along the coast starting and ending at Rialto Beach, Kalaloch or Ozette could provide enhanced educational and recreational activities, protect resources and promote stewardship.			
2850	Similarly, ranger-led interpretive canoe or kayak trips at Ozette and Lake Crescent could also be considered. Expanded interpretive signage relevant to the resources and history of a specific location both along the coast and in the Lake Crescent area, such as those in the Rialto Beach area, could also be developed in visually non-obtrusive spots along the Olympic Coastal Strip and the lake where hikers and backpackers and others would be able to easily view them. As already stated under "Wilderness" the primary facilities we propose for the coastal strip are ones for sanitation and emergency shelter within the park and along the trail.			
2851	Access along the Olympic Coastal Strip			
2852	A major logistical challenge for backpackers is transportation either to or from trailheads, and we propose the park partner with public bus transit systems to provide regular, safe, efficient and park-oriented visitor experiences for this recreation user from mid-June through mid-September. A model for this type of partnership is Lewis and Clark National Park with the Sunset Empire Transportation District to shuttle visitors between Fort Clatsop and the western trailhead of their Fort-to-Sea Trail (officially opened November 2005). Given the existence of the Clallam Transit System, Clallam Paratransit and Makah Public Transit, the National Park Service initiate discussion to potentially move to partnering with these public bus services to provide the access needed through transport for backpackers on a regular and timely basis along the Washington Coast Trail from Cape Flattery to the Queets River.			
2853	Specifically, starting at the northern terminus of the Washington Coast Trail at Cape Flattery, the Makah Public Transit could consider simply extend their service at least once each regular service day during peak season from their Tribal Center to both the Cape Flattery and Shi Shi Beach Trailheads. Clallam Transit already makes a connection with Makah Public Transit at once on regular service days, and this arrangement would thereby provide backpackers trailhead access on public transportation all the way from Port Angeles to either Cape Flattery or Shi Shi Beach trailheads. The Clallam Transit System, perhaps in coordination with Paratransit Services, could offer daily shuttles with various buses potentially to and from Ozette, Rialto Beach, LaPush, Oil City, the south bank of the Hoh River, Ruby Beach, Kalaloch, South Campground and to the store just south of the Queets River Hwy 101 bridge, finally to return to Port Angeles at the end of the day's run.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2854	<p>This would thereby provide backpackers with a public bus transportation system that would allow them to meet their logistical transportation needs to and from Port Angeles relative to various trailheads along the entire Olympic Coastal Strip and beyond plus connect with other services for transport to major cities such as Seattle, WA and Victoria, B.C. Since roads already exist to all the trailhead connections just specified, it would appear that impacts on natural processes and park resources would be minimal, if not negligible.</p> <p>Finally, we propose the park investigate the idea to potentially offer hikers and backpackers a boat transport service in compliance with US Coast Guard regulations with both the Quilleute and Hoh Tribes to cross rivers of the same name, respectively. If found viable and agreeable to the specific tribe, then we would propose the park facilitate the process towards implementing this water transport service.</p>			
2855				
2856				
2857	We appreciate this opportunity to provide our comments.			
2858				
2859	Al LePage, Executive Director			
2860				
2861				
2862				
2863	191169		Spokane	WA
2864	I believe the National Parks should be managed for use by all Americans to visit - including those who can only travel by vehicle. They should not just be set aside as wilderness/			
2865	animal habitat. These functions can still exist with public access.			
2866	I believe the failure to reopen Dosewallipes road in the Olympic Parks since its washout 5 - 6 years ago is wrong. This makes the entire NE quadrant of this park unavailable to those who cannot hike many miles and carry a pack. Includes ME!			
2867	188671		Tacoma	WA
2868	I fully support expansion of park boundaries for the purpose of protection and restoration of these rare coastal forest areas. I personally do not believe increased access is warranted or beneficial. I have no basis for that belief, other than a desire to see future generations live in as green and wild of a Washington as I grew up in. Wilderness preservation should be the primary goal.			
2869				
2870	I strongly believe existing property rights of residents should be respected. Little would be gained, and much public support would be lost if people are forced from existing homes occupying a generally small footprint.			
2871	It is fair to compromise the business interests which own land in these areas, since their activities run counter to the goals of this proposal. In the long run, preservation and wise stewardship of these unique forests will boost the economy more sustainably than exploitation.			
2872				
2873	Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these comments.			
2874	188665		Seattle	WA
2875	I would like to provide comments on the General Management Plan for the Olympic National Park. I live in Seattle but my family is also an inholder property owner in the Ozette Region of the park.			
2876				
2877	I strongly encourage further protection of the land in the Ozette Region in any manner and the expansion of the Park's boundaries to protect wild areas. It is shocking to me that the decimation of the land that can legally occur. Over the years, I have seen the unprotected land along the Hoko-Ozette road and past the Ozette Ranger Station on the logging road headed north decimated by greedy logging companies who show absolutely no regard or respect for the land. Logging trucks are still out there tearing through the remaining trees in this region, even small trees that are too small to provide any meaningful worth. We are still in an era of unregulated destruction of the Olympic Peninsula. It is time to turn the tide and start protecting this land.			
2878				
2879	I would support any plan to expand the Park so that logging ceases in the Ozette Region. Even the land that has been decimated in recent years by clearcutting should be added to the Park so that it can grow back in peace, roads can grow over, and in a hundred years there will be a new wild land for future generation to enjoy.			
2880				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2881	I am less concerned with which of plans B, C or D you ultimately select. I'd prefer the option that supports wilderness over use. But that's like talking about wilderness over use in a place where an atomic bomb has been dropped. It matters to me very little whether there will be more parking lots or less, power boats or not. What matters is that the few remaining forested areas in the Ozette Region finally gain protection from logging and that the areas that have been decimated be protected so they can grow back.			
2882				
2883	I hope that whatever plan is selected will be sensitive to those of us individuals who own homes within the Park's existing and expanded borders. Most of these property owners respect or can learn to respect the land they live on without being kicked off their land. It is the logging industry, which has shown years of abuse, disrespect, and utter disregard for the land, that should be turned out of this region entirely.			
2884				
2885	Please add my comment in support of Options B, C, and D, with the understanding that I support any of these plans because they expand the wild areas of the park and would provide protection and rehabilitation of the land from the ravages of chainsaws over the years.			
2886	190550		Brinnon	WA
2887	Thank you so much for the work you've done on this document and for giving me			
2888	the chance to comment. I live in Brinnon and hike in the Park. I was born in			
2889	Olympia and have lived in Sequim, Joyce, and Brinnon for about 1/3 of my 62			
2890	years. I'd like to thank you also for establishing reserves on the Olympic			
2891	Coast and recommending wilderness study for Lake Ozette in your plan.			
2892				
2893	I believe that your highest priorities should be 1) non-degradation of natural			
2894	systems and 2) restoration of natural systems.			
2895				
2896	Please keep developed areas and development zones at their current size as			
2897	described in Alternative A. New recreation developments should be located			
2898	outside the national park.			
2899				
2900	Please expand park boundaries in five areas: 1) Lake Ozette, 2)Lake Crescent,			
2901	3) the Hoh watershed, 4) the Queets watershed, and 5) the Quinault watershed.			
2902	Expanding the park boundaries will protect critical habitats for salmon and			
2903	wildlife as proposed in Alternative B.			
2904				
2905	Please establish river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and			
2906	natural river processes as proposed in Alternative B.			
2907				
2908	Please give all 13 rivers Wild and Scenic river designations.			
2909				
2910	Please restore extirpated species such as the wolf and fisher, even though			
2911	they will eat some of my cats.			
2912				
2913	Please defer controversial decisions about designated Wilderness until a			
2914	comprehensive management plans is completed.			
2915				
2916	Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on all your hard work.			
2917	191242		Seattle	WA
2918	Place emphasis on preserving Olympic National Park as a "wild" ecosystem. There are already hundreds of choices for tourists who want developed area. Leave a few for the wild.			
2919	191222		Forks	WA

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2920	Letter on file			
2921	190962		Port Angeles	WA
2922	Thank you for planning for the future of the national treasure that is Olympic National Park.			
2923				
2924	I respect and agree with the vast majority of actions (and non-actions) proposed in the preferred alternative of the General Management Plan draft. I do however have a few concerns, some with regard to specifics and some with regard to generalities. Some of my comments have to do with the lack of acknowledgement of watersheds as entire ecologic units in need of comprehensive protection. The rest of my comments have to do with education and general park funding.			
2925				
2926	In the Mitigative Measures section of the plan, there is a small sub-section of 'Hydrologic systems.' Before reading this section, I assumed that it would describe the importance of managing entire watersheds and recognizing the downstream effects of actions, especially actions that involve physical disruptions to the environment. Reading the actual notes in this sub-section, I felt that either I or the management planning team had mis-interpreted 'hydrological systems' and I looked for a section on 'watersheds' or 'watershed protection' in the mitigative measures, only to find no such section. To me, this is an omission.			
2927				
2928	I have some problems with chapter 2's preferred alternative land acquisition regional maps. Olympic National Park is in a position to acquire land to further protect the existing National Park lands and embellish protection to include entire watersheds. Specifically, I would like to point out that in the cases of Lake Crescent and Lake Ozette, Olympic National Park could act to protect headwaters and even entire watersheds near critical habitat for endemic (Beardslee and Crescenti Trout) and endangered (Ozette Lake Sockeye) fish species but has chosen not to.			
2929				
2930	Speaking as an ex-Interpretive Ranger in Olympic National Park, I must say that to the greatest extent possible, education should be furthered in the park. In my experience, the most meaningful sort of education does not require people to be an invasive species in remote wilderness sections of the park, or even in every frontcountry section of the park. The most meaningful education requires person to person contact, preferably with a low visitor to educator (Interpretive Ranger) ratio. I suggest that Olympic National Park plans for greater educational programs and longer visitor center hours in existing visitor centers in order to best foster future protectors of National Parks.			
2931				
2932	A general comment I have is this: I am surprised that there is not even a nod to protecting watersheds in their entirety in this document. I am also surprised that planning and provisions are not made to secure greater funding for Olympic National Park, and for education within Olympic National Park specifically.			
2933				
2934	We all must agree that it is easier to be a critic than a planner and my comments are in no way intended to detract from the hard work park planners have done. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and be involved in the future planning of Olympic National Park as well as the future enjoyment (in most cases, for me enjoyment = protection) of Olympic National Park.			
2935	190802 - MASTER FORM LETTER			
2936	My family and I care very much about the future of the Olympic National Park. We urge the Park in its general management plan to pursue a fully restored ecosystem with its original components, processes, and habitat functions intact. Use should be managed to insure visitor enjoyment with the primary focus on protecting the health of the park's ecosystems into the future.		Mountain View	CA
2937	Significant changes have taken place since the last management plan in 1976. Roads, logging, and residential development of forest lands now characterize much of the park boundary. Increased recreational use of all types places demands on resources. Cumulative impacts on lower rivers and salmon streams and illegal hunting pressures have harmed park wildlife, fragmented habitats, and impaired ecosystem functions. Visitation to the park has increased dramatically, doubling since 1976.			
2938				
2939	To deal with these threats to the future ecological integrity of the park, the general management plan must be bold, farsighted, and embrace a broad view of the Park Service's role in maintaining the larger Olympic Peninsula ecosystem. Your 1976 master plan provided this kind of guidance for most of the past few decades, but I feel the preferred alternative in the current draft falls short of those goals.			
2940				
2941	I appreciate and support those recommendations in the preferred alternative D that drive the plan towards long-term protection. In particular, I support the following:			
2942	" Establishing marine intertidal reserves along sensitive areas of the coast.			
2943	" Recommending Wild and Scenic River designation for the Elwha River.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2944	" Relocating the highway and other use facilities out of coastal erosion and flood-plain zones, decreasing risks to public.			
2945	" Expanding educational and interpretive programs.			
2946	" Encouraging mass transit in heavily used developed areas.			
2947				
2948	In contrast, several other recommendations in the preferred alternative D threaten the park's ecological integrity by emphasizing developed recreation and motorized access over natural resource protection and species restoration. I therefore urge you to:			
2949	" Expand park boundaries through land purchase in five areas (Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, and Hoh, Queets, and Quinault watersheds) to protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife as proposed in alternative B.			
2950	" Establish river protection zones to ensure that critical salmon habitats and natural river processes are preserved as proposed in alternative B. In addition, I recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic River designation.			
2951	" Recommend the recovery for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species and their habitat, and control of invasive and non-native plants and animals.			
2952	" Keep developed areas at their current size as described in alternative A. New recreational developments are best located outside the national park.			
2953	" Defer all decisions relating to wilderness until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed and available for public review.			
2954				
2955	This plan is a great first step in addressing the many issues within our national park, and I look forward to the next step in your planning process to provide further comment.			
2956				
2957	Thank you for your time and consideration.			
2958	191190		Hoquiam	WA
2959	I am upset over some of the propsales about the managment plan of the nationl park. The government owns most of the land on the Olympic Pensluia. They do not the rest of it. The park service does not have enough money to take care of what they already have.			
2960	190808	Queets-Clearwater School District	Queets	N/A
2961	To: Olympic National Park			
2962				
2963	From: Queets-Clearwater School District			
2964	Board of Directors			
2965	We are writing to share our concerns with you regarding the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan-Environmental Impact Statement. This project is of great concern for the future of our children's educational opportunities.			
2966				
2967	Land expansion of park boundaries will greatly reduce our tax base. We are already affected with the loss of revenues and employment opportunities. Any further losses will greatly cost the next generation and those future generations to come.			
2968				
2969	Please do not forget the children.			
2970	188495		Port Angeles	WA
2971	Deer Park - Yes to Alternative D.			
2972	Ozette - Yes to Alternative D because the lake will be protected.			
2973	190780		Seattle	WA
2974	Most people are unaware that the temperate rain forest of our Olympic Peninsula is one of the rarest ecosystems in the world, and that the animals and plants existing only there have been largely uncatalogued. Scientists do not know what is needed to sustain that rich diversity of life. I strongly urge you not to risk the health of our forests, food, water, air, and, thereby, ourselves by altering one of the precious few unique natural areas left to sustain us.			
2975				
2976	I applaud you for preserving the outer coast intertidal strip. The protection of our beaches has already made a step toward preserving the lovely Snowy Plover. Thank you also for recommending a wilderness study for Ozette Lake.			
2977				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
2978	As proposed in Alternative B, please obtain a secure buffer of Ozette Lake and Lake Crescent and the Hoh, Quinault, and Queets river watershed zones to allow natural river processes and to maintain critical fish habitats. All thirteen (13) eligible rivers need to be federal Wild and Scenic river designations.			
2979				
2980	I also ask that you keep all developed areas and development zones in the park at their current size - as stated in Alternative A. NO NEW AND NO EXPANDED developed areas, development zones or commercial concessions inside the park boundary. Federal court THOROUGHLY REFUTED the park's claim that historic structures of all types "enhance wilderness character". The park should be enjoyed as it is.			
2981				
2982	Plan to re-introduce animals, the wolves and fishers, that once were native there.			
2983				
2984	Controversial decisions regarding designated Wilderness need to be deferred until a comprehensive wilderness management plan can be completed, and I request it. Illegal elk hunting from nearby roads is a continuing problem and this, among many other things, must be addressed.			
2985				
2986	Thank you for this opportunity to speak strongly for the preservation of the Olympic National Park, truly a national treasure.			
2987	190669		Seattle	WA
2988	I am an avid hiker and backpacker and enjoy the backcountry of ONP whenever I can. While the solitude, quiet, sounds and smells of the backcountry are what I seek, I want to experience them via well maintained trails with adequate signage even in the wilderness. There should be no loss of trails we need them more and more. Also, please retain and protect the human history of this special park that is exhibited through the buildings, structures, and sites left behind by earlier residents and managers collectively they tell a compelling story, that enriches one's visit to the park.			
2989				
2990	In the preferred alternative, the GMP states that the museum collection will be housed in a facility that meets the majority of NPS standards. Is this acceptable? Can the local museum in Port Angeles be a partner in helping to care/house part of the collection? The community would have another opportunity to learn about the cultural heritage of the park this way.			
2991				
2992	Please remove the interpretive panels that are in the backcountry in places like Royal Basin. I was shocked to see the large "educational" sign upon arriving at the lake, after working so hard to get there. There needs to be a better way to educate the public about park efforts when one is so far from a road.			
2993				
2994	It would be a wonderful treat to be able to traverse the park on foot and not have to bring two cars in order to do such a hike. This would require a shuttle system of some kind perhaps through a concessioner, during the summer months. Another job opportunity for a local entrepreneur.			
2995	191178	City of Port Angeles	Port Angeles	WA
2996	Letter on File			
2997	190804	Conservation Northwest	Bellingham	WA
2998	CNW appreciates this opportunity to comment on Olympic's Draft General Management Plan (GMP). We agree with much of Olympic Park Associates' (OPA) recommendations, and submit these comments in the hope that they will lead to a sound plan and a positive future for this significant, world-renowned natural preserve.			
2999				
3000	Conservation Northwest (CNW) is a regional conservation organization representing 5,000 members that are dedicated to the preservation of wilderness, old-growth forests, roadless areas, and other regions important to the conservation of Washington's fish and wildlife. We have a long history of promoting conservation on the National Forests and Parks of Washington State, and other public lands. Many of our members use this area for recreation, and we have great interest in assuring that the park will be managed in a way that will preserve its pristine qualities and unique environment.			
3001				
3002	Our goal for Olympic National Park over the next 20 years is a fully restored ecosystem with its original components, processes and habitat functions intact. Use would be managed to insure visitor enjoyment of the park with the primary focus of protecting the health of its ecosystems throughout the future. We agree, given the park's legal mandates and agency policies, that this should be your goal as well.			
3003				
3004	Significant changes have taken place since the last management plan in 1976. Roads, logging, and residential development of forestlands now characterize much of the park boundary. Increased recreational use of all types places demands on resources. Cumulative impacts on lower rivers and salmon streams and illegal hunting pressures have harmed park wildlife, fragmented habitats, and impaired ecosystem functions. Visitation to the park has increased dramatically, doubling since 1976.			

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
3005		For a general management plan to deal with these kinds of threats to the future ecological integrity of the park, it must be bold, visionary, and encompass a broad view of Olympic's role in maintaining the larger Olympic ecosystem. Your 1976 master plan provided this kind of guidance for most of the past few decades, but we feel the preferred alternative in the current draft falls short of those goals.			
3006					
3007					
3008		We appreciate and support those recommendations in the preferred alternative (D) that move the plan in this direction. Particularly, we support the following:			
3009					
3010		" The establishment of intertidal reserves this issue has been exhaustively discussed by the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary advisory committee. Recommending establishment of the reserves is a bold step, and one to which we hope you will remain committed.			
3011					
3012		" The park's intent to recommend boundary expansions to protect habitats for threatened and at-risk wildlife populations.			
3013					
3014		" A wilderness study for Ozette Lake, Pyramid Peak ridge, and future additions. Ozette is the last coastal wilderness lake outside Alaska and richly deserves protection.			
3015					
3016		" Wild and scenic river designation for the Elwha, but we fear the significant expansion of the development zone in the valley works against watershed restoration.			
3017					
3018		" The relocation of the highway and other use facilities within coastal erosion and flood plain zones, which will decrease risks to the public.			
3019					
3020		" The park's intent to expand educational and interpretive programs, develop short interpretive trails, and encourage mass-transit in high-use areas.			
3021					
3022		All of these recommendations are a strong start toward a GMP worthy of a World Heritage Site and international biosphere reserve.			
3023					
3024		In general, however, we find the preferred alternative of the draft GMP to be lacking in the critical qualities mentioned above: boldness, foresight, and sense of the park's place in the larger Olympic ecosystem. The draft is timid in its approach to resource protection, and many of its protective measures are compromised and inadequate to protect park resources into the future. We feel that much of what alternative (B) proposes would provide for a more sound ecological approach to preserving the significant ecosystems that remain within Olympic's boundaries. The lack thereof in the preferred alternative drives several concerns.			
3025					
3026		Specifically, alternative (D):			
3027					
3028		" Denies "river protection zone" status to the park's rivers, many of which provide critical habitat for a number of federally listed threatened and endangered salmon stocks. In particular, rebuilding washed-out roads with rock armoring destroys salmon habitat and compounds impacts on fish. The proposed Dosewallips road reconstruction, for example, will harm critical spawning areas for federally threatened Puget Sound Chinook. If the intertidal reserves can be applied, why not include river zones specified in alternative (B) to aid in safeguarding salmon throughout their full spawning cycle. Merely protecting them through the estuary zone is not sufficient.			
3029					
3030		" Maintains all road access throughout the park, including floodplains, regardless of impacts to salmon habitat and natural river processes. Recommends moving wilderness boundaries on active floodplains to maintain poorly located roads. In particular, continued bulldozing of Finley Creek channel in the Quinault area will continue in the plan, impacting salmon and other wildlife habitats simply to provide year-round access.			
3031					
3032		" Transforms zoning designation from wilderness into use levels without supporting reference or justification. Wilderness related issues should be guided by a wilderness management plan that considers proposed uses according to their wilderness impact, directed under the Wilderness Act.			
3033					
3034		" Has proposed boundary expansions that are inadequate to protect down-stream fish species from destructive upstream activities like timber harvest and road building. For example, Ozette Lake sockeye and Puget Sound chinook, listed under the ESA, are at risk as well as spawning areas for the unique Beardslee and Crescenti trout. Park elk populations are also experiencing hunting impacts due to nearby roads.			
3035					

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
3036	3037	In particular, we find a lack of support for the substantial development expansion. Even though visitor trends are continuing upward, a correlation likely exists with increases in population growth. We cannot continue to supply a limited resource to an increasing demand. At some point visitation will be maximized, and while our limited knowledge of ecosystem connectivity constricts how much of the park we can make available, we have the ability to control visitation if necessary. We ask you to take heed for the future of the park and be cautious as you advance.			
3038	3039	We also note that alternative (D), as described on page 68, "&includes slightly more development zone acreage in the frontcountry when compared with alternative (B), and slightly less than alternative (C)." When comparing (B), (C) and (D) in the subsequent maps, the preferred alternative reveals development and use proposals nearly, if not identical to those in (C) in 9 of the 13 frontcountry zones, with significantly more development than (B). "Slightly" more or less is clearly an understatement. Accommodating visitor use, as a priority, should not be a focal goal that overrides wilderness protection. If use expansion persists, as outlined in the preferred, the very wilderness we are protecting will continue to shrink. While we appreciate accommodating all types of users, CNW would like to reiterate the growing concern that current population growth has already placed significant pressures on wildlife regimes around the world. What remains in our extraordinary park is rare and vital to its continued, intact existence.			
3040	3041	Furthermore, increases in visitor use and road construction throughout the park over forthcoming years will exacerbate current hydrologic problems. Considerable research on the impacts of forest roads advises decommissioning problematic sections (see Redwood National Park for guidance). Many of the valley floors within ONP are flood plains that already encounter geomorphic changes, including network extension and increased peak flow, due to road construction in higher elevations. We would like to reaffirm what hydrologic research suggests and ask you to include considerations for decommissioning where washout problems persist.			
3042	3043	Finally, we feel the draft plan lacks the opportunity to address a number of larger issues that would insure sound ecosystem management in the face of an uncertain future. We ask park planners to reconsider these recommendations, many of which are outlined in OPA's 2001 scoping letter, for inclusion in the final GMP.			
3044	3045	" An ecosystem study from which to base critical resource management decisions,			
3046	3047	" a recommendation to reintroduce wolves and the fisher into the Olympic National Park,			
3048	3049	" a plan to address and eradicate invasive and non-native species, not just discuss their occurrence within the park,			
3050	3051	" provide wild and scenic river recommendations for at least 12 park rivers that qualify for congressional designation, and			
3052	3053	" a wilderness management plan that will address numerous controversial decisions regarding wilderness management in light of requirements of the Wilderness Act.			
3054	3055	While the DEIS presents substantial discussion of the necessary balance between natural preservation and human use, we find that the dialogue does not actually support an equilibrium. Significant use expansion proposals and focus on cultural concerns consistently override natural resource protection in several arenas. Our national park, one worldly considered a biosphere reserve, should put forth its greatest efforts to protect the very nature of its existence. As we all know, it is much easier to be cautious than to attempt to revert to original conditions. Therefore, it is imperative that we collaborate to provide this region with the utmost respect and defense, especially as external forces continue to pressure its few-remaining, pristine qualities.			
3056	3057	We provide the aforementioned suggestions and concerns in hopes that wildlife and wilderness protection will continue to be the chief goal for Olympic National Park. CNW would like to see a final GMP with clear guidance, that is well balanced and reasonable, and provides these spectacular ecosystems with the protections necessary to insure a healthy environment; one which will endure the challenges of the coming decades.			
3058	3059	188505		Sequim	WA
3060	3061	Thank you for asking me to submit thoughts about a visitor interpretive center at Blyn. While I have not talked with the Chair of the Jamestown Skallam Tribe, I think that such a center would resonate with continued expansion of their cultural center, gift shops, hotel, conference center, and casino operation. Access to the riches of Olympic National Park is important to all people who live in proximity to the mountains and the seashore.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3062	Encouragement to explore and utilize the resources of Olympic National Park is parallel to learning how to balance one's curiosity with the needs of the ecosystem. All living beings are of inestimable value, flora and fauna.			
3063				
3064	Finally, what better way to connect with the lives of tribal people but with a large welcome for tourists and townspeople who travel between Sequim and the Hood Canal Bridge?			
3065				
3066	Thanks for sending the full report. Look forward to meeting and talking with you at our next Klahhane Club gathering.			
3067	188264		Portland	OR
3068	No need to reply. Comments: thanks for being thorough, and a review of summary plan appears to protect the wilderness nature of the park. I'm an annual hiker there and appreciate all you can do to manage and control man's impact on an amazing park by permitting. Thanks!			
3069	190717		Bellevue	WA
3070	My first hike in Olympic National Park was in 1938, weeks after it was made a park. In following years I hiked in its depth repeatedly.			
3071				
3072	"Depths" that's the essential quality of the park. It has DEEP wilderness in superb quantity. Yes, it also has SHALLOW or EDGE wilderness. However, its companion mountain range, the Cascades, has a plenty of the "shallow," notably along the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway of Interstate 90, the other valleys north and south, and (of course) Mount Ranier National Park.			
3073				
3074	Olympic Park should be managed to feature its DEEP wilderness.			
3075				
3076	For example, the Dosewallpis. When first I hiked there, the road ended at Constance Creek. To be sure, the parking was inadequate and could not be increased there due to the geography. Later the road was extended upvalley from the falls to a large flat suitable for trailhead parking and a car campground.			
3077				
3078	WRONG MOVE. WRONG DIRECTION. The opportunity offered by Nature now exists to move the other way. Chop back the road to the vicinity of the downstream flats, Elkhorn or thereabouts. This would DEEPEN the wildness of all the splendid Dose country, to Anderson Pass on one fork, to the headwaters of the other fork.			
3079				
3080	The other major opportunity to DEEPEN is Obstruction Point. I have backpacked from Deer Park along the Grand Ridge a number of times. It is among the grandest ridge-riuns in my experience. By proper timing, I have always done so when the road was not open from Hurricane, and thus my camps at the Point were motorfree, wheelfree, DEEP.			
3081				
3082	There is no reasonable need to be able to drive the meadows of Hurricane Ridge. Revert that road to trail and another great ridge-run would be created, joining the other at the Point.			
3083				
3084	I cite these two examples of what ought to be done at Olympic. Others could be mentioned such as the proposed cutting back of the Hoh Road.			
3085				
3086	The "world-class wilderness" of Olympic can be augmented wonderfully, to the benefit of the DEEP WILDERNESS experience of hikers, as well as the wildlife.			
3087				
3088	188603		Port Angeles	WA
3089	Thank you for encouraging and facilitating public comments over an extended period of time and in an impressively thorough way. We appreciate the recognition of Olympic National Park's importance to the people who live on the Olympic Peninsula and visit the Park from other nearby areas. This is appropriate because the Park is one of the most significant contributors to the wellbeing of the communities closest to it. Its protected beauty, clean air and waters, and relatively intact ecosystems not only attract tourists, but they also attract people who come here to live.			
3090	But we also recognize that our National Parks have a much broader constituency. Olympic has a responsibility to make sure its unique ecosystems will continue for the sake of the plants and animals of the Park as well as the world's people nourished by its qualities now and in future millennia.			
3091				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3092	Even though we have more interest in Olympic National Park than the dozens of other national parks we have visited and usually restrict our comments to the Park in our neighborhood, we submit these comments with the expectation that the National Park Service pay heed to people who have far more expertise than any of us ordinary local citizens have and that they proceed with a perspective that is far more expansive than local priorities.			
3093				
3094	Olympic National Park's top priority must be protecting its unique qualities. That was why it was established. That is the main responsibility of the National Park Service and the public servants who are supposed to provide for its sustenance. These qualities are becoming increasingly important as population pressures and such environmental impacts as global warming and pollution make it harder to sustain them.			
3095				
3096	The reasonable way to ensure such protection while providing for increasing numbers of visitors is to delineate between areas where human usage will be most intense and where wilderness qualities should prevail. Prime areas for visitation such as Hurricane Ridge and Kalaloch should be able to absorb growing numbers of visitors. A few other areas, perhaps including Deer Park, might be made more accessible.			
3097				
3098	The small downhill ski area and cross country skiing trails at Hurricane Ridge should not be harmful if planning includes more parking, more transit and bicycle lanes that will reduce use of private vehicles, and paved paths with provision for handling runoff from rain and snow. Transportation so people can get to trailheads from ferry, bus and air terminals is especially important. Keeping the Park's uniqueness despite accommodating large numbers of people in certain areas also makes it essential to prohibit snowboarders on cross-country trails, jet skis on lakes and loud boat motors. The Park should do everything possible to reduce noise pollution, including noise from airplanes that can destroy the sense of solitude even in remote parts of the Park. People can experience all these things in many places. Olympic National Park needs to keep its uniqueness, not become like just anyplace, especially when other places are becoming so crowded, polluted, noisy and removed from natural connections we need for our mental and physical wellbeing.			
3099				
3100	Getting ready for more visitors also means making sure all access roads are safe. ONP should recognize the safety problems associated with the two-lane portion of Highway 101 and work toward a four-lane highway.			
3101				
3102	Concessions should be appropriate for the park. Sol Duc is an example of ugliness that does not belong in a national park. The Hurricane Ridge food service is completely inappropriate for a place that should emphasize good nutrition. The amount of space devoted to gift stores seems excessive. All the concessions should use as much locally produced, organic food as possible and set an example for living in harmony with the natural world.			
3103				
3104	Instead of expanding lodging and campgrounds, ONP should let private enterprise provide for those who don't want to hike into the backcountry.			
3105				
3106	Wilderness areas need just as much attention so trails don't become channels of erosion, culverts don't block fish passage, and shelters are kept very limited to prevent too many people in one place and avoid harming natural qualities. Small, interpretive areas such as Humes Ranch aren't likely to cause problems, but many other structures are inappropriate. Road construction and maintenance must be done in the most protective way possible for such natural characteristics as flood plains and wetlands.			
3107				
3108	An ecosystem approach to protecting the Park's qualities will become increasingly important. Animals, plants, air and water know no boundaries. Studies of ecosystems need to provide the basis for long-range planning. The park will need to keep expanding as adjacent areas impinge increasingly on it. More attention needs to be given to intertidal preserves along the coast. Rivers need to be given more protective status.			
3109				
3110	Since it will not be possible to protect all the ecosystems through park expansion, it is essential for ONP to work with others who can help protect wildlife that will go outside of the Park. Tribes, other governmental entities, land protective organizations like Land Trusts, and educational institutions like Olympic Park Institute are among partners with whom the Park should collaborate. The Elwha River restoration project can be a model for restoring and protecting other watersheds, especially salmonid streams and wildlife corridors, as well as lakes and nearshore areas. ONP has a responsibility to provide factual information to the public about threats to its glaciers and other natural qualities due to global warming.			
3111				
3112	Restoring ecosystems also means giving greater consideration to bringing back wolves, fishers and other extirpated species.			
3113				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3114	In summary, the National Park staff has provided good information and is to commended for recommending a balanced alternative. But even that alternative puts Olympic National Park's unique qualities too much at risk. If we lose them, we not only will have lost a valuable economic asset for our area but we also will have lost an irreplaceable asset for our planet.			
3115				
3116	Thank you for considering these comments.			
3117				
3118	190852	Olympic Coast Alliance	None Provided	N/A
3119	The mission of the Olympic Coast Alliance is to assure a healthy coastal ecosystem through public education, conservation advocacy, and particularly to support the integrity of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. The planning alternatives include many positive aspects, and show deference to our concern for the appropriate management of intertidal zones, river protection, and the use of land immediately adjacent to, and upstream of critical salmon habitat.			
3120				
3121	We would like to see the park strengthen protection of rivers by recommending Wild and Scenic river designation where appropriate. These rivers are crucial to protection and recovery of Washington State's endangered salmon runs. We must do everything in our power to protect this habitat and minimize harmful actions.			
3122				
3123	For these reasons we suggest that developed areas and zones in the park are not expanded. Future developments, commercial and recreational, should be located off National Park managed land. This is an environment that is already coping with human impact. Rather, we suggest that the park keep these areas undeveloped and expand its boundaries to include watersheds within the areas of Lake Crescent, Lake Ozette, and the river systems of the Hoh, Queets and Quinault.			
3124				
3125	The completion of a long overdue comprehensive wilderness plan would be very helpful in addressing our goals. We strongly support the designation of intertidal reserves. In addition we suggest that there be recognized high use areas to contain human impacts to small areas of the fragile intertidal zone. Frequent human presence can have negative impacts on the productivity and biodiversity of these areas.			
3126				
3127	The recommendation of a wilderness study for Lake Ozette and the designation of intertidal reserves show your dedication to managing these sensitive lands positively. We applaud you for this and urge you to continue positive management of this remarkable park. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.			
3128				
3129	191186		Newport	RI
3130	Letter on File			
3131	191156	Hood Canal Environmental Council	Seabeck	WA
3132	Letter on File			
3133	190737	Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation	Olympia	WA
3134	Thank you for contacting the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). The above referenced Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement has been reviewed on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer under provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) and 36 CFR Part 800. My review is based upon documentation contained in this document.			
3135				
3136	State Archaeologist, Rob Whitlam, has also reviewed the draft. We are in agreement that, if the preferred alternative plan (D) is enacted, its implementation will generally have "No Adverse Effect" on the historical and cultural resources that contribute to the character and significance of Olympic National Park. We note that some individual or collective actions proposed to implement the plan may have the potential to adversely affect historic and cultural resources. DAHP anticipates that, when such instances occur, Olympic National Park will, as in the past, fully comply with Section 106 consultation requirements.			
3137				
3138	Please note that DAHP requires that all historic property inventory and archaeological site forms be provided to our office electronically. If you have not registered for a copy of the database, please log onto our website at www.dahp.wa.gov and go to the Survey/Inventory page for more information and a registration form. Also note that DAHP has developed a set of cultural resource reporting guidelines, which you can obtain from our website.			
3139				
3140	DAHP appreciates the National Park Service's continued commitment to preserving historic and cultural resources at Olympic National Park while attempting to balance natural and cultural concerns with ever increasing visitor use. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. Should you have any questions, please contact me.			
3141	190531 - MASTER FORM LETTER		None	N/A

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3142	I have had the pleasure of knowing about Olympic Hot Springs since 1991. I it is one of the most special places in the Olympic National Park. When I here people talking about the "special place" they go to in their minds when they are stressed or upset, I think of Olympic Hot Springs. In 1991 I took a hike to Olympic Hot Springs in November. I was soaking in the upper pool totally enjoying the cold air when it started snowing. This is my "special place," please do not take it away. I use the hot springs as often as I can but especially in the off season.		Provided	
3143				
3144	I understand there are several proposed plans to change Olympic Hot Springs. As I understand them, NONE of the four proposed alternatives adequately addresses the special nature of Olympic Hot Springs. I whole heartedly endorse the Naturist Action Committee on the following issues:			
3145				
3146	A. Retain soaking at Olympic Hot Springs, but reduce the number of pools at the Springs site to three or four, located near the main source. This will improve cleanliness by offering less restriction to flow. It will help rehabilitate the runoff area, reduce the impact of use and enhance the integrity of the environment.			
3147				
3148	B. Contract the maintenance of the resource to an experienced caretaker. This approach has been implemented with great success by other agencies responsible for managing hot spring resources in the Pacific Northwest.			
3149				
3150	C. Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail beyond the Altair site. This is similar to an item proposed in Alternative B of the draft of the General Management Plan.			
3151				
3152	I believe:			
3153				
3154	1. Clothing-optional use at traditional sites in the park, like Olympic Hot Springs, is an environmentally friendly, low impact use of the resource.			
3155				
3156	2. Naturists are responsible stewards of public lands.			
3157				
3158	3. "Rehabilitation" of Olympic Hot Springs does not require that the resource be made unusable for those seeking remote recreational experiences. Other details of Alternative D, the NPS-preferred plan, accommodate traditional uses, and the traditional use at Olympic Hot Springs should be among those that are retained.			
3159				
3160	Thank you for you time.			
3161	190545		Tacoma	N/A
3162	Please do everything within your power to Save our Beautiful Olympic			
3163	Rainforest, and add adjacent buffers to ensure that it remains vital.			
3164				
3165	This is a Gift that we Must treasure, and pass onto future generations!			
3166	190534		Eugene	N/A
3167	To whom it may concern at the National Park Service;			
3168				
3169	I strongly urge you to adopt a plan that saves The Olympic National Park's integrity as a world-class natural area.			
3170				
3171	It is good news that you have decided to preserve the outer coast portion of the park. However, as usage increases in ONP, and as development of land near the park continues, wider buffers of the unique ecosystems need to be in place. It would be wise to extend the park's boundaries (including the significant buffer zones mentioned above) around both Ozette Lake and Lake Crescent and ALL the pristine rivers and streams that drain the Olympics. Expanding the park (something like alternative B) would help to protect salmon and other wildlife important to the diversity of ONP. There should also be plans to re-introduce animals, such as wolves, that once inhabited the area.			
3172				
3173	And included in that consideration, I urge you to keep all developed areas in the park as they are now -- a recommendation of Alternative A. I urge NO NEW developed areas. Plans for new services, attractions, campgrounds, and other development should only be allowed OUTSIDE the park boundary.			
3174				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3175	I agree with the view advanced by many people at the recent Audubon Ecology Workshops; that the Olympic National Park is very important to future generations. We must save what remains of un-manipulated nature. I hope you decide to act responsibly and preserve the integrity of this biologically rich area.			
3176				
3177	Thank you for this opportunity to urgently argue for the preservation and expansion of this beautiful World Heritage Site.			
3178	190961		Bellevue	WA
3179	Dear Sirs, I write in opposition to the General Plan options A-D in regards to the future of Olympic Hot Springs (Boulder Creek Hot Springs). Such a unique environment for Washington State deserves extra effort in preserving the traditional use as a place for people to enjoy natural hot springs. Our state has a history of destroying hot springs rather than managing them. I would point to Oregon's examples of managing their natural hot spring resources.			
3180				
3181				
3182	Clearly the Nat'l Park has had problems with abusive use of the springs area. But the four alternative plans for the spring offer little difference in approach to correcting and preserving the springs. There are other options for managing these wonderful springs in their natural setting.			
3183				
3184	The Park Service does not face this task alone either. Private industry, Non-profit groups, and Volunteers can be mobilized to support use of the spring. Give them a chance, since the Boulder Creek site is the last functioning and accessible natural hot spring on public land in Washington. The others have been destroyed or developed like Sol Duc Hot Springs.			
3185				
3186	The experience of being at Boulder Creek is religious to many people. It is the last place to go for this experience. Each time that I visit it, I notice the wide variety of visitors the are drawn to these springs. It is a magical place that deserves extra efforts to preserve access. Please add some options to managing the use of the springs as a place to soak in the water and connect with nature.			
3187				
3188	191239		Federal Way	WA
3189	First of all, in your own words enhance opportunities for public enjoyment related to park purposes. I am a disabled veteran who uses this area for boating especially motorized boating. Several of my DAV come to the lake for an afternoon of boating. Several of us do not have limbs required for row boats. I ask that you allow motorized boating on Lake Ozette, every bit of it. We will feel discriminated again. My feel of all my disabled friends feel the same. Senator Jackson on 10/1/76 - Sec 332 of HR 13713 says, "present public access as well as private owners, as well as visitors to the park who may wish to boat." DAV#460338429135 Chapter A One #33.			
3190				
3191	189428		Seattle	WA
3192	Dear Stewards of our public lands,			
3193				
3194	I believe that it is important to open ONP to more visitors and make it more friendly to the citizens of the US. Existing policies and regulations have taken the fun and joy out of visiting the park. The park should be for the average citizen to enjoy not simply the purists and environmental extremists.			
3195				
3196	Please consider alternative C that provides more public access.			
3197	190957		Sequim	WA
3198	I would like to endorse Olympic Park Associates' (OPA) analysis and recommendations as they pertain to your GMP DEIS.			
3199				
3200	Specifically, I support the preferred alternative's intent to establish "no-take" intertidal reserves on the park's productive and biologically diverse coastal reefs, and to manage coastal recreation so as to conserve biodiversity.			
3201				
3202	I support a wilderness study for Ozette Lake, the ridge north of Lake Crescent, and all potential wilderness additions on current or to-be acquired lands.			
3203				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
3204	3205	I welcome a renewed commitment to education and interpretation of the park's natural and cultural resources. The interpretive program at Olympic is all-important to foster public understanding and appreciation of Olympic, and it has suffered drastic cuts over the past two decades. An appropriate interpretive goal would be to restore the number of seasonal interpreters to the level of 1988, the park's 50th anniversary, which I recall to have been 38. The current number is significantly less.			
3206	3207	I am in favor of voluntary mass transit in heavily used areas at peak seasons. I would also favor mandatory mass transit for the Obstruction Point road during peak times of use. Dust is a perennial problem during dry summer months; parking "spillover" is impacting meadows, and marmots are imbibing automotive fluids. Shuttles for sightseers, hikers and backpackers would mitigate these problems, and provide an additional opportunity for interpretation.			
3208	3209	I fully support the preferred alternative's intent to develop all-accessible loop trails in the park's front country. I was involved with development of three of these trails in the 1980s. They have reduced crowding on the lower sections of the park's wilderness trails, and they are a great way for visitors to experience quiet moments in the park. With accompanying booklets, they provide a means to introduce visitors to deeper aspects of the park's story.			
3210	3211	I support the preferred alternative's recommendation to expand park boundaries in the Ozette, Lake Crescent and Queets River corridor. I request that the final EIS include the science-based recommendations for all additions described in alternative B. History shows that when Congress reviews agency recommendations, political compromises come into play. It appears in the preferred alternative that these recommendations have already suffered such compromise.			
3212	3213	I support the Wild and Scenic River recommendation for the Elwha. I was disappointed that no recommendations were made for disposition of Elwha project lands. The GMP would be the appropriate vehicle for the NPS to make a recommendation on this issue. I also recommend that the 12 remaining rivers that are eligible for wild and scenic protection be recommended for designation in the final EIS. As with park expansions, this will be a congressional call. The agency should supply the best, current, scientifically based information available in its recommendations.			
3214	3215	Lastly, regarding rivers, I strongly urge that the river zones proposed in alternative B be included in your preferred alternative. Of the legion of threats facing park resources, the precipitous decline in wild salmon and steelhead stocks is most alarming. I believe river the zone prescription can be revised so that any washout will not precipitate a road closure. But I consider it urgent, particularly for river systems like the Hoh, which is least tainted by hatchery stocks, that stronger means of protection for native fish, fish habitats and natural stream processes be put in place. Rivers are the veins and arteries of the larger Olympic ecosystem. They supply vital links to the ocean, Strait and Puget Sound. As the premiere conservation agency on the peninsula, the park should be managing for the protection of the larger ecosystem, particularly as our environment undergoes profound change.			
3216	3217	I won't belabor my disagreements with preferred alternative. But I would like to offer a few suggestions.			
3218	3219	Expansion of development zones beyond current uses strikes me as wholly out-of-proportion with historic use patters of the park. I do not believe NPS must plan to accommodate all desired future uses of the park. Rather park managers should determine appropriate levels of use for a wilderness park like Olympic, and plan accordingly. I agree with conservationists' long-held conviction that future recreational developments and accommodations should be sited outside the park. This was reflected in the 1976 master plan. With the exception of educational facilities like OPI and interpretive developments like the all-accessible trails mentioned above, it is in everyone's best interest to let the private sector cater to our growing number of tourists. Let the park do what it does best: protect and interpret the outstanding natural resources that draw them here.			
3220	3221	Toward that end, I recommend that the final plan phase out the commercial downhill ski development at Hurricane Ridge. It is inconsistent with the goals of a national park. It's an eye sore and a known money-loser. Declining winter snowpacks have severely limited its viability. Yet it remains a source of pressure to increase levels of commercial development on the ridge, lifts, lodge, and road. It serves less than 10% of winter visitors to the ridge. This GMP cycle provides an opportunity to return Hurricane Ridge to more compatible uses.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3222	Similarly, the GMP offers an opportunity to take a considered look at the park's road network, particularly in light of changing climatic patters and the increasing frequency of road-damaging floods. Traditional fixes of riprap and channelization only compound the problem. New approaches are badly needed. The Dosewallips road presents a stark example of traditional motorized use in direct conflict with natural resource protection, in this case critical habitat for a federally listed species. The position taken by the park, to reopen/maintain the Dosewallips Road is unfortunate. The continued channelization of Finley Creek, for the sole benefit of maintaining a year-round loop road, is an embarrassment. Please consider a road-to-trail conversion on the Dosewallips, and review responses to the last Finley Creek EA for reasonable solutions to the Finley Creek problem.			
3223				
3224	Nationally, park service management policies have recently stepped back from a politically motivated position favoring recreation and visitor use over conservation. New management at Interior and the director's office suggests a return to time-honored park service values. We hope Olympic will reflect this change as you reconsider the plan's recommendations regarding roads, developments, and resource protections.			
3225				
3226	I would like to endorse OPA's recommendation that the park, through the GMP, become an advocate for wolf reintroduction -- and the ecological and economic rejuvenation that accompanies it. It's in your management policies. I also ask that the plan's direction concerning management of exotic species, specifically non-native mountain goats (to name the unnameable), adhere to NPS policies on management of non-native species.			
3227				
3228	I regret the absence of an ecosystem study and wilderness management plan to guide you in these efforts. I believe the de-facto wilderness management decisions put forward in this plan, without specific reference to the requirements of the Wilderness Act, are ill-advised. The appendices, replete with sites, structures and landscapes to be maintained, restored, and re-created are exhaustive, but they fail to meet the "new value" placed upon the land in 1988 by designation of the Olympic Wilderness.			
3229				
3230	On a related note, I notice in the plan's glossary that approximately 19 of 24 entries pertain to cultural resources. "Cultural landscape" receives five paragraphs; "Wilderness" is awarded two lines. With Olympic considered by many to be the most biologically rich and diverse wilderness park in the nation, this lopsided emphasis is troubling.			
3231				
3232	Regarding the document. A shorter summery that laid out the alternatives in simple form, with a few good maps for wide distribution, would have invited a fuller level of public response. The 400-page document was nobody's book club pick. But with the important issues it addresses, it should have been. Public meetings held during the peak summer vacation season were also unfortunate. I appreciate the 15-day extension of the comment period. But a multi-year planning effort like this would have benefited by a more "user-friendly" approach to public involvement.			
3233				
3234	I hope the final plan reflects the detailed citizen input you do receive. I hope you reconsider some critical elements of your preferred alternative and present a final plan that offers sound direction for protecting all park resources into the twenty-first century.			
3235				
3236	Thank you for this opportunity to comment.			
3237	190512		Steliacoom	WA
3238	Having hiked and climbed in Olympic National Park for many years, it's preservation is very important to me.			
3239	The coast line with it's tide pools, marine mammals and marine bird population is a fabulous place. I would like to see Ozette Lake become part of this wilderness area.			
3240	If at all possible Crescent Lake should be part of the National Park.			
3241	Olympic National Park does NOT need anymore developed areas. New development should only take place outside Park boundaries.			
3242	All original species of wildlife that once inhabited the Park, should be protected or re-introduced (wolves, fishers).			
3243	190906		Torrey	UT
3244	Although I am currently living in Utah, I was born and lived for 50 yeras on the Olympic Peninsula and plan to return in the future.			
3245				
3246	I wish to express my strong opposition to the Olympic National Park General Management Plan alternative D and urge you to adopt Alternative A and continue with the current management.			
3247	188633		Seattle	WA

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3248	my children who 1st visited the springs while they we're 4 & 5, will soon be wanting to take their children to the natural Hot Springs. In all the yrs I have visited, over 20, I have never visited a made springs like Soul Duck. Olympic also has the distinction of being a long enough walk in to keep down the less considerate visitors. I hope you have all visited or will visit before making such an important decision.			
3249	191002		Union	WA
3250	Subject: Comments on Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan			
3251				
3252	I attended the meeting in Shelton and very much enjoyed meeting with the staff. Thank you for the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Book. I read most of it and will keep it. The book was interesting and impeccable. Overall I am very pleased with your Alternative D preferred plan and think it strikes a perfect balance of use of the park and protecting it. Alternative D would be my choice.			
3253				
3254	Addition comments:			
3255				
3256	Fire management- I think forest fires in the park should be fought aggressively. I can understand to a point letting nature run its course if it was hundreds of years ago. But I think this day and age the old growth forest are too rare and valuable to let any burn.			
3257				
3258	Visitor use- Monitor visitor comments on encounters with other visitors in the backcountry and such. Good idea.			
3259				
3260	Air Quality and Soundscapes- Very important			
3261				
3262	Paved Obstruction and Deer Park roads- A big NO,NEVER.			
3263				
3264	Hurricane chair lift- No			
3265				
3266	Trails, Bridges, Roads- I think no new trails are necessary. Just keep the current ones in shape and bring back any abandon ones. Bridges fixed especially the Staircase Loop bridge. No new roads just keep the ones we have maintained. The Dose road needs to be fixed and the push to stop it put to rest. I don't want the environment damaged. But the Environmental Protection seems to get to extreme these days and no progress can be made on maintenance.			
3267				
3268	Issues not addressed in the General Management Plan-			
3269				
3270	1. A big NO, NEVER to building a cross park road			
3271				
3272	2.Installing bear wires and outhouses in all high use wilderness campsites. Good idea.			
3273				
3274	3. Recycling programs. Good idea.			
3275				
3276	4. Grooming Obstruction Point road for cross-country skiing. I don't think that is necessary, is it?			
3277				
3278	Historic Structures and Shelters. (abet of a hot issue with me) I am all for aggressively purse basic preservation maintenance activities to avoid costly rebuilding or reconstruction of historic structures or cultural landscapes. I think all structures that are in the park should be saved and not removed like some people do. They are a important part of the parks history and very useful and needed. I do not think they take anything away from the wilderness. Man is a part of wilderness too and think the structures fit right in with their natural weathered wood and moss.			
3279	I was happy to hear the efforts to save the Enchanted Valley Chalet have been successful. It is a wonderful, rare, unequaled, and useful structure. I still think the dirt bank beside it should be quietly shored up. Be it steel plates and big logs or just big logs. It would look natural and there are plenty in the area already down. On the shelters it is a shame there will be no more at Home Sweet Home and Low Divide. Although I was in shock and don't understand the cost it took to build them. It was a double shock that a lawsuit was made to stop the replacement and won.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3280	On your list of Classified Structures I was very happy of all the shelters,guardstations,cabins, and such to be retained. Especially the Chalet, Elkhorn guardstation, Remanns cabin, Dodger Point fire lookout, etc... I think Dodger Point is a important location for support and it is about the last surviving lookout in the park. Which brings me to say I hope you retain all the rest of the structures especially Happy Hollow, Elk lake, Blue Glacier 1 and 2, Olympus guard, Mink Lake, 12 mile, Trapper, and Bear Camp Shelters. The Hayes River Patrol cabin I think is very important for ranger support in the middle of no where. It is a cool structure and has a history being built by the Student Conservation Program volunteers. The Snow Dome UW is another important structure for support on Mt. Olympus activities and glacier study. The Low Divide Ranger Station for ranger presence is important here. When we stayed there it was abit of a zoo. Lots of people and a sense of a party atmosphere with yelling and whooping.			
3281				
3282				
3283	Conclusion:			
3284				
3285	As you say staffing levels would continue to be inadequate and not meet park needs. Another hot and sad issue with me. I commend and appreciate staff and volunteers for doing as much as they can with limited resources. After meeting with your staff at the Shelton meeting I know the park is in the best hands it can be. I just do not understand how Congress can continue year after year to keep cutting your funds. More rangers are needed for interaction with new visitors, nature hikes, law and order etc... It also puts stress on existing rangers, making them frustrated and makes for low morale. It was sad to see Staircase closed down for the winter this year. It made me feel the park was in abandonment and neglected. We are lucky to have ONP, Rainier, and N .Cascades. I think they are the top 3 National Parks in the states and the world. They are a hikers dream, a must for society and Earth. Plus good for the state economy. Thank You Much for your time. Good luck!			
3286	191011		Poulsbo	WA
3287	Thank you for the opportunity to review the plan and for hosting the			
3288	informative open house in Silverdale on August 22, 2006. I prefer			
3289	the alternative that provides the greatest protection for the park's			
3290	ecosystem. There are other places, including Olympic National			
3291	Forest, State parks, county parks and privately owned facilities in			
3292	the area for recreational opportunities that compromise ecological			
3293	integrity. There is no other place to comprehensively protect the			
3294	integrity of the ecosystem. It requires a large area to maintain			
3295	ecological functions. Even the no action alternative would result in			
3296	the loss of natural resource function and value over time because of			
3297	invasive species, increased human pressure and cumulative impacts in			
3298	the region. Please do not increase developed areas in the Park and			
3299	expand boundaries as needed to protect habitats for salmon and wildlife.			
3300				
3301	I support abandoning roads when they cannot be repaired without			
3302	adverse effects to salmon habitat. If there is not a solution that			
3303	meets the ESA threshold of "not likely to adversely effect" listed			
3304	species, please close the road. I am disappointed the Park supports			
3305	rebuilding the Dosewallips Road in the National Forest. That washout			
3306	removes only five miles of access.			
3307				
3308	Thank you for establishing the intertidal reserves on the Olympic			
3309	Coast and recommending wilderness study for Ozette Lake.			
3310				
3311	Finally, I very much want to have wolves in the Park. I have camped			
3312	in several places in the park that seem over populated with rodents			
3313	and think more predators would be healthy. It has been wonderful,			
3314	exciting and joyful to see bears, marmots, raptors and other			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3315	beautiful creatures in the wild. In Yellowstone Park, wolves have			
3316	helped in a number of ecological ways. I would love to have them			
3317	closer to home. They belong here and I am willing to do my part,			
3318	including paying taxes and fees, hiking farther, camping with low			
3319	impact, and doing volunteer work to allow for responsible stewardship			
3320	of our ecosystem.			
3321				
3322	Thank you for consideration of these comments.			
3323	191012		Poulsbo	WA
3324	Thank you for the opportunity to review the plan and for hosting the			
3325	informative open house in Silverdale on August 22, 2006. I prefer			
3326	the alternative that provides the greatest protection for the park's			
3327	ecosystem. There are other places, including Olympic National			
3328	Forest, State parks, county parks and privately owned facilities in			
3329	the area for recreational opportunities that compromise ecological			
3330	integrity. There is no other place to comprehensively protect the			
3331	integrity of the ecosystem. It requires a large area to maintain			
3332	ecological functions. Even the no action alternative would result in			
3333	the loss of natural resource function and value over time because of			
3334	invasive species, increased human pressure and cumulative impacts in			
3335	the region. Please do not increase developed areas in the Park and			
3336	expand boundaries as needed to protect habitats for salmon and wildlife.			
3337				
3338	I support abandoning roads when they cannot be repaired without			
3339	adverse effects to salmon habitat. If there is not a solution that			
3340	meets the ESA threshold of "not likely to adversely effect" listed			
3341	species, please close the road. I am disappointed the Park supports			
3342	rebuilding the Dosewallips Road in the National Forest. That washout			
3343	removes only five miles of access.			
3344				
3345	Thank you for establishing the intertidal reserves on the Olympic			
3346	Coast and recommending wilderness study for Ozette Lake.			
3347				
3348	Finally, I very much want to have wolves in the Park. I have camped			
3349	in several places in the park that seem over populated with rodents			
3350	and think more predators would be healthy. It has been wonderful,			
3351	exciting and joyful to see bears, marmots, raptors and other			
3352	beautiful creatures in the wild. In Yellowstone Park, wolves have			
3353	helped in a number of ecological ways. I would love to have them			
3354	closer to home. They belong here and I am willing to do my part,			
3355	including paying taxes and fees, hiking farther, camping with low			
3356	impact, and doing volunteer work to allow for responsible stewardship			
3357	of our ecosystem.			
3358				
3359	Thank you for consideration of these comments.			
3360	190551		Joseph	OR

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3361	Please accept these comments on the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. I request a return receipt.			
3362				
3363	While the EIS preferred alternative attempts to find a balance between developed visitor experiences and preserving ecological integrity, it falls too heavily on the side of development. I am concerned about the proposal to expand on the numerous and spread-out development zones.			
3364				
3365	Olympic National Park's highest priorities should be preserving its natural systems, restoring threatened wildlife, and protecting the integrity of its world-class wilderness through managing people. I believe that the proposal should only focus on development that will promote education that will in turn help protect ecosystems. Recreational and comfort oriented development should be kept minimal and focused outside the National Park, where it should also be minimized.			
3366				
3367	The draft plan offers some positive conservation measures to protect resources and restore threatened fish and wildlife, but I ask that these measures be built upon so that they reflect the ecological ecosystems and native wildlife as the highest priority for the Park. For example, I ask that the park service establish river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural river processes are preserved as proposed in alternative B, and to recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic river designation. I also ask that the park service recommend restoration of extirpated species like the wolf and fisher.			
3368				
3369	I strongly support the proposal for establishing intertidal reserves on the Olympic Coast and recommending wilderness study for Ozette Lake.			
3370				
3371	I am a strong advocate of expanding the Park Boundary, especially because of the island nature of this ecosystem. I urge the park service to expand park boundaries in five areas (Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, and Hoh, Queets and Quinault watersheds) to protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife as proposed in alternative B.			
3372				
3373	Because Wilderness is such a unique resource, I request that all decisions relating to wilderness be deferred until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed and available for public review.			
3374	Thank you,			
3375	190719		Seattle	WA
3376	Please consider my comments in development of the Draft EIS for Olympic National Park.			
3377				
3378	The highest priorities should be non-degradation of natural systems and restoration of critical ecosystem functions!			
3379				
3380	The developed areas and development zones should be kept at their current size as described in Alternative A.			
3381				
3382	Expand the park boundaries in five areas to protect critical habitat for salmon and wildlife as proposed in Alternative B.			
3383				
3384	Establish river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural river processes are preserve as proposed in Alternative B, and recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic river designation.			
3385				
3386				
3387	Recommend restoration of extirpated species like the wolf and fisher.			
3388				
3389	Any controversial decisions relating to designative wilderness should be deferred until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is complete.			
3390				
3391	Thank you for considering my comments.			
3392	190994	Skokomish Indian Tribe	Skokomish Nation	WA
3393	RE: SKOKOMISH TRIBAL RESPONSE TO NATIONAL PARKS SERVICE'OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN / EIS			
3394				
3395	Dear Superintendent Laitner:			
3396				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3397	On behalf of the Skokomish Indian Tribe, its Cultural Resources Department and its Natural Resources Department, we respectfully request your acceptance of these comments as they pertain to the above referenced document.			
3398				
3399	The Olympic National Park (ONP) EIS Alternative D is a plan the Skokomish Cultural Resources/Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) can work with. We recommend continuing efforts at notifying our office when projects are planned, and we would like to use our archeologist and monitors for any survey work to be done. We suggest developing a protocol list on how artifacts are handled and where they are housed. We want to house any and all Skokomish /Twana / tuwaduq artifacts the ONP has now and may recover in the future. We would also like to nominate areas of ONP for either eligible or nominated status to the National Register of Historic Places, possibly as a cultural landscape.			
3400				
3401	We understand some information can be used to educate the public; however we want to include in the development of a protocol, a provision for confidentiality. We would also like to rename sites using our tuwaduq ancestral name for areas within the ONP. This would be an excellent educational opportunity. We would like to have further meetings about the types of plants and other foods available for harvesting for spiritual purposes in Staircase and Dosewallips areas. Further meetings may be necessary to understand how and why we use these areas, and how we would like to protect these and other sites within the ONP area. We would also like to have further meetings to discuss developing private areas within ONP for purification and spiritual needs.			
3402				
3403				
3404	Delbert Miller			
3405	Cultural Resources Director, THPO			
3406	Skokomish Tribe			
3407				
3408				
3409	Additional natural resources issues brought forward during discussions from July 12, 2006:			
3410				
3411	The EIS / Draft Plan states ONP will continue to provide certain protective mechanisms to varied resources of concern to the Tribe, consistent with treaty rights issues. Individual tribal members should not be expected to have their access or treaty-protected activities restricted or regulated. The Skokomish Tribe concurs with the Preferred Alternative D identified in the Plan.			
3412				
3413	The current Olympic National Park was a former National Monument, its nearly million-acre landscape resides at the center of the Olympic Peninsula. But prior to any federal or state designations, the area was and continues to be part of the usual and accustomed areas of the Skokomish, as it has since time immemorial. It is the Tribe's desire to be more involved and provide comments on Park projects. The Tribe anticipates more collaborative and cooperative opportunities with the Park. The Skokomish Tribe acknowledges the other tribes affected by the Park, and supports their sovereign abilities to communicate their concerns with the Park. The Skokomish Indian Tribe may share certain concerns with other tribes, but government-to government relationships are expected to be honored, including opportunities for consultations.			
3414				
3415	Superintendent Laitner expressed the Park "would certainly like to work more with the Tribe. If we had a project on the east side of the park, we would notify the Tribe for initial feedback. If the Tribe wishes, we could have a tribal member on site during project work, and we would have a plan for discovery. We also could provide a follow-up report". As mentioned in the previous comment by Delbert Miller, the Tribe would like to implement the appropriate protocols and methodologies that could include on-site observers, plans for inadvertent discovery and reporting requirements, and identifying certain sites for ceremonial and spiritual purposes.			
3416				
3417	When asked about ONP identifying any ethnographic resources found eligible as cultural landscapes, your response was " No, not as cultural landscapes. We could evaluate them with the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) criteria though, if the Tribe would like them evaluated" and ONP would be interested in working with the Tribe. The Tribe expects such interactive dialogues.			
3418				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3419	As discussed in our meeting, the Tribe is very interested in the reconstruction of the pedestrian bridge at Staircase, as it provides access to traditional areas for the tribal community, including its elders. The Tribe agreed to work collaboratively with Park staff to assist them in soliciting certain funding support for the project and rebuilding the bridge. Park staff commented that unfortunately, fire suppression needs tend to outweigh this bridge reconstruction as the fiscal years' end. The Tribe believes if the bridge is part of the Preferred Alternative D, it should not be weighted against fire suppression, but treated as both a cultural and recreational enhancement.			
3420				
3421	Final comments related to natural resource issues are addressed by two critical elements taking place within the Skokomish watershed. The Tribe believes they require Park consideration. These elements were not brought up in our discussions but are related to others, and to each other.			
3422				
3423	The Tribe co-manages the fisheries and associated habitat with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, (WDFW) within our usual and accustomed area as defined by the 1855 Treaty of Point No Point, later affirmed in US v Washington, and referred as the Boldt Decisions. The co-managers determined a Skokomish Salmon Recovery Plan is to be developed this year, with an emphasis on the ESA-listed stocks, including Puget Sound Chinook, Hood Canal summer chum and coastal bull trout, but addressing all salmonids. Coastal steelhead are also proposed for listing. This product is in development and can benefit from fruitful dialogue with Park staff. Landlocked salmonids in Lake Cushman and Park waters do not have the access opportunities to pursue the anadromous characteristics associated with life history behaviors.			
3424				
3425	The related element is the recent US District Court decision regarding the Federal Regulatory Commission / Tacoma Power Cushman Project #460. The Court identified in an August 18th 2006 Decision, its support of certain improvements to the watershed conditions. The Department of Interior 4(e) conditions include supporting flow regime modifications, and fish passage past the two Cushman dams, in addition to other critical watershed enhancements. The implementation of these 4(e) conditions has long been a goal of supporting restoration of full watershed integrity in its entirety, from the Skokomish estuary and delta to the headwaters of all basin tributaries. Such access includes passage past the dams that block the salmonids' ability to exhibit their anadromous characteristics. Such blockages have violated the Federal Power Act for 70+ years. Along with the out-of-basin diversion of the North Fork Skokomish, the fisheries and associated habitat have been deleteriously affected, challenging the treaty rights of the Tribe.			
3426				
3427	These 4(e) conditions are critical to treaty rights protection. The Skokomish Indian Tribe believes the Olympic National Park, as a representative of the federal fiduciary trust relationship to the Tribe, is obligated to support the Tribe in this regard. Such support for the 4(e) conditions should have no direct bearing on the Park, its Management Plan EIS or Preferred Alternative D. In fact, it is a mutual collaborative opportunity that may have certain pro-active bearing upon the Park, its waters, organisms, and adaptive management strategies for full watershed restoration.			
3428				
3429	The Skokomish Indian Tribe believes increasing dialogue and communication, may help facilitate such reciprocal objectives with common goals and outcomes, particularly within a fisheries utilization framework. Olympic National Park landscapes provide the potential template for relative pristine conditions and index areas, that can be used to monitor and track restoration trajectories, and offer specific opportunities in adaptive management, within a framework of cultural protection, environmental education, and stewardship. The Tribe believes ecological restoration is not mutually exclusive of cultural restoration. Certain synergies exhibited between and among these issues, and the anticipated increased dialogues, support pro-active pursuits.			
3430				
3431	Thank you for accepting these comments. Please do not hesitate to contact the Tribe for further information, clarification, or to schedule follow-up discussions that include consultations.			
3432				
3433	Sincerely,			
3434				
3435				
3436	Keith Dublanica, Director			
3437	Skokomish Natural Resources			
3438	(360) 877 -2110 x457			
3439				
3440				
3441				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3442	190697		Port Angeles	WA
3443	In general I support alternative B because I believe that we need to protect what few resources we have left in this country as strongly as possible. I do not support enlarging any development zones; I encourage closing downhill skiing and supporting X-C and Snowshoeing. Roads in river corridors are too expensive to maintain over and over, year after year. When they go, let them go. Trails easier to maintain. Study wilderness wherever possible. Study Ozette as a whole system. The only crack in my armor is the road to Obstruction Point&is it expensive to maintain? How much (damage to resources) to maintain it? I'd like to know more before making a decision on that. Thank you.			
3444	188260		Olympia	WA
3445	I am in favor of resource protection as a priority with additional day/public use, as suggested in Alternative Plan D - as long as much education is provided at these sites and impact are minimal on habitat and resources.			
3446	190812		Brinnon	WA
3447	I need to make this quick because I do have to work. My full-time job is not to find conservation issues in my state to champion. I have to say this about the Parks Long-Term Boundaries and plans for the next 50 years. We have been to meetings, we have made comments and yet it seems to do no good. I noticed that the public comment meetings recently have been held in the small communities that are affected and then one larger meeting at REI in Seattle. No matter how many affected residents we get together, we can not compete with the population from areas like Seattle. None-the-less, we do live here and it's our land that you're playing with. Our communities are generally poor and don't have funds to organize opposition groups. We don't have the time. We work.			
3448				
3449	I am not in favor of the way that you are conducting the public comment process. I am not in favor of the possibility of the Park taking land by eminent domain or forcing long-time residents to move. Why, when land is for sale in your "long-term boundary" limits, don't you purchase the land and make everyone happy? I've asked before and never received an answer. Why not contact the people affected personally BEFORE the meeting and try and work out something agreeable to all parties? Even though logging and other activities have compromised land in our area, ask yourself, who is using the resource. Is it the poor families in 1970's trailers or is it well heeled, well paid, urban and suburbanites building new homes?			
3450				
3451	I'm neither a conservationist, environmentalist nor a conservative. I'm a realist. I have years of education relating to the environment. I appreciate it in it's healthiest form. I also live here. If you want our land, buy it.			
3452				
3453	190662	Washington Native Plant Society	Olympia	WA
3454	Because the Olympic Peninsula, with Olympic National Park, contains one of the rarest ecosystems in the world, with much more scientific study needed to understand and sustain this unique ecosystem , we urge you keep the developed areas and development zones at their current size as described in Alternative A. We urge you only to allow new recreational developments outside the national park.			
3455				
3456	We encourage the Park Service to expand park boundaries in the five areas that will protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife as proposed in Alternative B. (Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, admn Hoh, Queets and Quinault watersheds)			
3457				
3458	We believe that River protections zones should be established to ensure that critical salmon habitats and natural river processes are preserved as proposed in Alternative B and we recommend all 13 eligible rivers receive federal Wild and Scenic river designation.			
3459				
3460	We urge the Park Service to restore those animals such as the wolves and fishers that once were native to the Olympic Peninsula.			
3461				
3462	Please defer controversial decisions relating to designated Wilderness until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed.			
3463				
3464	Establishment of the intertidal reserves on the Olympic Coast and recommending wilderness study for Ozette Lake are definitely steps in the right directions. Please do no compromise this ecosystem.			
3465				
3466	Thank you.			
3467	190788	Quileute Tribe, Natural Resources	La Push	WA
3468	Letter on File			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3469	189872		Mercer Island	WA
3470	The Olympic temperate rainforest is a very special place. I am very pleased that the National Park Service is planning to establish intertidal reserves on the Olympic coast and is recommending wilderness status for Ozette Lake. The highest priority for the Olympic National Park should be no further degradation of its natural systems and restoration of critical ecosystem functions.			
3471				
3472	I sincerely request that developed areas and development zones are not expanded and kept to their current size as described in Alternative A. New recreational development should be located outside of the park.			
3473				
3474	I urge you to expand the park boundaries in five areas: Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, and Hoh, Queets and Quinault watersheds to protect critical habitats for salmon and wildlife as proposed in Alternative B.			
3475				
3476	Please establish river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural river processes are preserved as in Alternative B, and recommend al 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic river designation.			
3477				
3478	As part of habitat restoration of critical eco systems, I urge you to reintroduce extirpated species like the wolf and the fisher.			
3479				
3480	Please defer controversial decisions relating to designated Wilderness be deferred until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed.			
3481				
3482	Please use this opportunity to offer the best ecological protection of this very special place. There are very few places like this on the earth.			
3483				
3484	I share the goal that the Olympic be a fully restored wilderness ecosystem with its original components and habitat functions intact. Human use will be managed to ensure enjoyment of the park while protecting the healthy functioning of its ecosystems into the future.			
3485	190822	Board President, Snolsle Natural Foods	Everett	N/A
3486	I am a long term park user. You can view my images from this years two week			
3487	exploration of the coastline at http://home.att.net/~s.w.moore			
3488				
3489	The plan should focus on enhancing the environment of the park for the			
3490	native species that make the area their home. Develop a unique Wild and			
3491	Scenic River plan for each of the rivers in the park. Develop no new roads.			
3492	Reduce the number of motorize vehicles and limit their access. Maintain the			
3493	existing park infrastructure, but do not invest in new visitor facilities.			
3494	Increase the funding for wilderness rangers and expand their presence in the			
3495	park. Acquire as much land adjacent to the park as possible and begin the			
3496	process of restoring them as natural habitat.			
3497				
3498	Your most important task is to preserve and enhance the natural environment			
3499	of the park. So my kids, their kids, and the generations that follow can			
3500	enjoy it's natural beauty.			
3501				
3502	Sincerely,			
3503	191158	Seattle Audubon Society	Seattle	WA
3504	Letter on File			
3505	188317		Hoodsport	WA

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3506	One of the things I would not like to see happen in the management plan is for quotas to be established in certain popular backpacking areas. I am thinking presently of Sand Point at Ozette, Seven Lakes Basin at Solduck and Flap Jack Lakes at the Staircase (there may be others). I feel that as far as the beaches are concerned that the plastic washing up on the beaches do more damage to the natural setting than people camping do (Beach log fires excepted). Although I think that there is a younger more destructive group of people out there than when I grew up, I think that this can only be controled by back country rangers and perhaps something like the "neighborhood watch" among responsible hikers or backpackers (if they could get to a radio fast enough). As far as the quotas in the high places are concerned (alpine)I feel that the good (allowing more people to camp)outweighs the bad. Yes, additional campsites destroy the heather but there shouldn't be any campfires or firewood gathering above 4000 foot. Irresponsible people are not going to pack out their trash but volunteer groups like WTA will(also clean up the beach). I believe in building enough toilets or a privy would really be helpful in any area overused.			
3507	Overall I think the Park is doing a good job of management. I think having and maintaining bearwire to hang food on and encourageing the 5 gal plastic buckets to keep food at the beach to keep away raccoons out works if reminders are present at the trailheads. I would like to see the trail shelter at Anderson Pass maintained and the Chalet in the Enchanted Valley saved from the river encrochment. I think allowing horses or llamas on ceratin trails is fine and allowing dogs on leash on certain beaches (like Rialto) is fine. I am glad to see certain log bridges being replaced by the steel tube beams as they will last a long time.			
3508	The things I would like to see would be certain trails maintained and put back in use like six ridge trail. I think the park should utilize volunteer organizations like WTA to do trail maintenance if funds are lacking. I would like to see the Dosewallops Road repaired and the campground at Dosewallops put back in use. Again I think the good outweighs the bad. For whatever reason enviromental groups blocked road repair the backpack out of the Dosewallops is a popular one. I would like to see the Staircase stay open year around and not see the gate shut duie to lack of funds.Perhaps volunteer RV type "camp host" could be used as in the state campgrounds. Our family has written letters to Washington State Senators and Representatives requesting more money for the park.			
3509	I do not have too much of an opinion on the removal of Lake Mills and restoring the salmon run except I am in favor of it. I do not have too much an opinion on keeping the Hurricane road open in the winter as I do not use it (we go to Mt Raineer to do backcountry skiing.)I would not want to see a road built to Shi Shi Beach on the north end of the Park. I think there is plenty of RV type camping at Rialto and the beaches to the south. Incidentally, our family went camping at Shi Shi Beach over the 4th of July. I think there was about 200 other campers out there and we knew we weren't going to be alone on the 4th. But we had a good trip and if we wanted to be alone we would have gone somewhere else. Again, I don't see a need for regulation of number of people in this area.			
3510	Lastly, if I had a wish for the future of the park and money was not an issue, it would be for better trails in some areas and to construct new trails in other areas. Some trails were built by miners and a lot were built and improved by work crews during the depression. Since then not much construction was done in most of our parks.			
3511	Of course I would like to see the rest of the park remain wild and untouched.			
3512	190712		Joyce	WA
3513	Draft GMP Public Meeting. August 18, 2006. Port Angeles, Washington.			
3514				
3515	Transcribed by Heather Henum.			
3516				
3517	I have lived here on the Olympic Peninsula for almost fifty-eight years, which is my age. I've hiked extensively through the Park system, mostly in my younger years. And at the present time I would like to comment on the Park's past policies of not allowing goats to be used as pack animals within the Park Service system. Not only here but throughout the US.			
3518	I was quite surprised when I started to look into getting goats as a means of transportation of packing equipment into the parks, same as many other animals are now allowed to be used, that they were not considered on their pack list. And I contacted people at the Olympic headquarters up here almost a year ago and that was confirmed. And the only justification that I could find was that they were not used in any Park Service system in the whole US and therefore they wouldn't allow it here.			
3519	My understanding is that it's being considered at this time that they may be allowed. And I would like to comment that I hope that you will allow them to be used in the Park. Because with my continuing age I cannot get into the areas that I used to at a younger age. And the goats would allow me to do this. I have packed a little with llamas. They're a little bit intimidating and quite a bit bigger. And horses are out of the questions. Not only are horses detrimental to trails, as are mules and burros, which you allow at this time. I can handle the goats quite easily.			
3520	I have six goats at this time and they are being trained at this time. And I hope that you would consider allowing us, myself and numerous other people from the local population, plus other people that I know that are interested in doing this. So please consider what I am requesting. Thank you.			
3521				
3522	190694		Joyce	WA
3523	I would like to request that the use of goats be included with other pack stock. I was quite surprised to find that they were not being allowed to take camping materials on the park trails.			
3524				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3525	They are much more trail friendly and habitat friendly than any other animal allowed on trails now.			
3526				
3527	As I grow older (58) it becomes more and more difficult to get into the areas I once used, with the pack goat it will allow me to reach the areas I once enjoyed.			
3528				
3529	I have six pack goats now and am looking forward to the day when I can use them here. Thank you.			
3530				
3531	191195		Port Angeles	WA
3532	Letter on File			
3533	190925	Merrill & Ring	Clallam Bay	WA
3534	Letter on File			
3535	191188	Clallam Bay Sekiu Advisory Council	Clallam Bay	WA
3536	Letter on File			
3537	191200	Juan de Fuca Scenic Byway Association	Joyce	WA
3538	Letter on File			
3539	190885		Denver	CO
3540	We are responding to an article published in the Seattle Times on August 20, 2006 sent to us by a friend.			
3541				
3542	As former residents of Oregon, recently moved to Colorado, we have traveled Route 101 many times around the lush Olympic Peninsula. We have not read the plan, but want to register our concern about the possibility of increasing development for visitors and tourists. The park is a National treasure and its very remoteness is one of its best assets. With increasing population, it becomes more and more necessary to preserve our treasured wilderness areas.			
3543	190679		Seabeck	WA
3544	Alternative D looks well though out and reasonable to us. Dosewallips Road provides valuable access to the park wilderness area and allows people other than strong hikers and backpackers to experience that wilderness. We would like to see the road rebuilt to allow driving from Hwy 101 to the old campground (location of park ranger cabin).			
3545				
3546	190900		Woodinville	WA
3547	I am writing this letter in reference to the plan for the Lake Ozette area in regards to the Preferred Plan. It is quite apparent to me that the Preferred Plan leaves much to be desired.			
3548				
3549	1. In reference to #2 of this plan it is stated the motorized boating might be restricted to avoid conflicts with other users. "Might" is not specific enough of a word. What conflicts are there with other users.? Who are they. Why should motorized users be culprets in a conflict? What statistics to you have to back up these conflicts? My guess is that when there has been a problem on the lake it has been due to weather and nonmotorized users. If motorized users were to be restricted how would many of the owners of property on the lake access their lands?			
3550				
3551	2. In reference to #6 of this plan it is stated that the park would buy up the lands on the east side of the lake if the owners of these lands were willing to sell. Suppose owners of these lands were to sell to the park and owners of other lands had depended on these lands to access their property. Would they be denied by the Park access to their lands? Can the Park Land Lock other land owners? In this time of deficit budgets it does not seem to be in the best interest of taxpayers to even consider such a plan.			
3552				
3553	To put it more bluntly if you are going to have different plans be more specific in what each plan would do and not what it might do. How can anyone be in favor of any plan that is open ended? As far as Ozette area leave it alone. Ever since the first settlers came to the lake there have been many changes some good and some bad but overall the lake is not a lot different than it ever has been.			
3554	190591	Friends of Lake Ozette	Clallam Bay	WA
3555	We, the undersigned, will only endorse Plan A of the 2006 Olympic National Parks General Management Plan, under which no changes in the current management strategies would occur. In addition, we oppose plans B, C and D and all they imply.			
3556	190916		Montesano	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3557	Letter on file			
3558	190910		Montesano	WA
3559	Letter on File			
3560	191167		Moscow	ID
3561	Letter on File			
3562	188669		Seattle	WA
3563	I strongly encourage you to enact alternative B as described in the General Management Plan. I believe that it is critical that the National Park system focus on natural and cultural resource protection. As you know, more and more Americans are visiting our National Parks. Given the plethora of entertainment options for modern society, the obvious reason that citizens are choosing to visit the Parks is because of the pristine wildernesses and preserved natural environment. In the long run, the best way to continue to meet the demand of visitors is to preserve the very thing that's drawing the visitors' interest -- namely, the protected natural environment.			
3564				
3565	In addition, other aspects of our lives are also positively benefited thru natural & cultural resource protection. Maintaining habitats for plants and animals leads to bio-diversity that can benefit agriculture, air-quality, science and medical advances across our whole society.			
3566				
3567	In short, it's worth reducing visitor access to sensitive areas and focusing on resource protection in order to best provide for the future strength of America.			
3568	190507		Brier	WA
3569	To whom it may concern,			
3570				
3571	I am writing to you with deep concern regarding the priorities set forth in the Alternative D Master Plan. My family has enjoyed the wildlife and pristine portions of Olympic National Park for decades. I spent an entire summer as a volunteer for this magnificent park. National Parks are defined by the beauty and wilderness not found anywhere else. Protecting these resources should be of the highest priority. Managing human intrusion so as to protect the often fragile ecosystems found in Olympic National Park is essential to this priority. We don't need to invite the problems that parks such as Yellowstone and Yosemite experience. Please keep development in Olympic National Park to a minimum.			
3572	191016	American Whitewater	Seattle	WA
3573	American Whitewater appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan (hereafter GMP). The staff from Olympic National Park (hereafter Park) and the Denver Service Center have done an excellent job of coordinating public meetings, sharing information with the public, and developing a draft plan that is thoughtfully organized and professionally presented. We appreciate the investment the National Park Service has made in producing a quality document with maps and accompanying text that clearly illustrate alternatives. This recognizes the significant investment members of the public have made throughout the planning process. This plan is important because it represents the first comprehensive planning effort undertaken by the Park since 1976, and the final document will provide guidance and long-term vision for the next 15-20 years.			
3574				
3575	Interest of American Whitewater			
3576				
3577	American Whitewater is a national non-profit 501(c)(3) river conservation organization founded in 1954. We have over 6,500 members and 100 local-based affiliate clubs, representing approximately 80,000 whitewater paddlers across the nation. American Whitewater's mission is to conserve and restore America's whitewater resources and to enhance opportunities to enjoy them safely. Founding principles of our organization include protection of the wilderness character of waterways and promotion of the recreational value of wilderness rivers.			
3578				
3579	As a conservation-oriented paddling organization, American Whitewater has an interest in the rivers of the Olympic Peninsula. A significant percentage of American Whitewater members reside in the Pacific Northwest and regularly take advantage of the opportunities for wilderness exploration that the Park offers. While the recreational opportunities are important we place a high value on protecting naturally functioning river ecosystems, including their fish and wildlife, geomorphic processes, and incredible riparian forests where natural successional processes dominate and produce a rich mosaic of vegetation patches. The Olympic Peninsula has been referred to as an "Island of Rivers, and the Draft GMP refers to water as a "unifying theme" of the Park. The river systems are thus defining landscape features of the Park that are highly valued by our membership and the general public.			
3580				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3581	Our members regularly take advantage of opportunities to explore the wilderness rivers of the Park. The National Park Service is directed to "provide opportunities for forms of enjoyment that are uniquely suited and appropriate to the superlative natural and cultural resources found in the parks." The rivers are clearly a superlative natural feature of the Park, which is unique for the diversity of wilderness river opportunities in the conterminous United States. For comparable opportunities one has to travel to Alaska or Canada, and with rainfall totals of more than 15 feet per year, the Park provides an incredible number of river miles in a small geographic area. Exploring the Park's rivers by hand-powered craft affords visitors with a unique opportunity to experience park resources, promotes enjoyment of the river and riparian landscape, and provides inspirational opportunities to experience wild rivers. Congress enacted the Wilderness Act "to assure that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions" The Wilderness Act describes "wilderness" as an area that has "outstanding opportunities for ... a primi			
3582				
3583	There are a number of rivers that our membership regularly enjoys in the Park. Unlike nearby rivers in Olympic National Forest the rivers in the Park offer unparalleled and unique opportunities for wilderness exploration. Rivers in the Park provide opportunities for primitive unconfined recreation where individuals have freedom to explore, can practice self sufficiency, and engage in a direct experience with the natural environment. The following are the primary rivers that provide this experience.			
3584	" Elwha River: The Elwha is perhaps one of the most visible expert whitewater runs in the Park that attracts visitors from across the country who come to experience wilderness opportunities on the Grand Canyon of the Elwha and Rica Canyon. Intermediate paddlers enjoy the front country paddling opportunities below Glines Canyon Dam on a reach that continues to the park boundary. The headwaters of the river reach into the interior of the Olympic Peninsula and the river cuts a path through the major geologic strata of the Olympics on its path to the sea. Traveling down this river one has a unique opportunity to experience the geologic history of the Olympic Peninsula			
3585	" Gray Wolf River: River trips begin in the Park at Three Forks and continue through the Buckhorn Wilderness to Dungeness Forks in Olympic National Forest. The river offers unique opportunities for wilderness exploration.			
3586	" Dosewallips River: The Elkhorn Canyon run on the Dosewallips begins at the base of Dosewallips Falls and continues downstream past the Park boundary. This river challenges regional experts who currently hike in past the road washout on Forest Service land to access this run. While the road provides convenient access the river itself provides a wilderness quality experience.			
3587	" North Fork Skokomish: The North Fork Skokomish provides opportunities for expert paddlers who hike six miles up the Skokomish Trail and paddle back down to Staircase. The river offers spectacular opportunities for wilderness adventure along sections of the river inaccessible by trail.			
3588	" Quinault: The Quinault River offers opportunities for paddling adventures on an intermediate river in the front country areas of the Park. The river is popular for fishing along the reach above Lake Quinault. Hike in wilderness boating opportunities are available upstream of Graves Creek.			
3589	" Quinault Gorge: The Quinault Gorge begins at the Pony Bridge and ends at Graves Creek. Expert paddlers hike in to run this wilderness river through a gorge that is inaccessible except at river level.			
3590	" North Fork Quinault: The gorge on the North Fork Quinault is well known as one of the most scenic wilderness sections of river in Olympic National Park. Every summer when flows drop to suitable levels, experienced paddlers hike in 12 miles on the North Fork Trail to Geoduck Creek.			
3591	" Tshletshy: This creek in the Queets River drainage is accessed by hiking up Big Creek Trail out of the Quinault drainage. This creek offers unique opportunities for wilderness exploration through a remote river canyon that passes through some of the park's most impressive old-growth forest. No trails pass through this remote region of the Park providing a unique opportunity to explore the Park's primeval wilderness areas.			
3592	" Sam's: The river is one of the more accessible rivers in the Park because the put-in can be accessed from Forest Road 2180 and the first few miles of river are on National Forest lands. The river ends by skirting the boundary of the Park before joining the Queets at the Queets Campground in the Park.			
3593	" Queets: The Queets Trail heads 16 miles up river from the Queets Campground to Pelton Creek. Wilderness paddling opportunities suitable for intermediates are available on this section of river for those willing to hike in and some individuals have explored the section upstream of Pelton Creek. The section from the Queets Campground to Hartzell boat launch provides roadside access in the front country zone and is popular for those who enjoy the fishing opportunities the Queets offers.			
3594	" South Fork Hoh: Individuals can hike in on the South Fork Hoh Trail and run a section of river that continues past the Park boundary. This is an easy day trip for paddlers through a short segment of wilderness.			
3595	" Hoh: The majority of paddling opportunities on the Hoh begin at the boat launch located just inside the Park boundary. Some individuals have hiked up the Hoh Trail to experience wilderness paddling opportunities available on upstream reaches.			
3596	" Bogachiel: The Bogachiel offers one of the most spectacular wilderness paddling opportunities on a west side river. Access is available by hiking up over the ridge from the Sol Duc and dropping into the Bogachiel drainage.			
3597	" South Fork Calawah: Access is available from Rugged Ridge on Forest Service land that provides convenient hike-in access to this river that provides a wilderness boating opportunity suitable for intermediate paddlers.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3598	" Sol Duc: This river provides one of the more popular intermediate paddling opportunities in the Park. Paddlers typically begin at Salmon Cascade and can continue out past the Park boundary onto Forest Service land. The fact that this river is in the front country zone makes it accessible as an easy day trip. With the exception of the section just downstream of Salmon Cascade, the road is largely hidden from the river providing a high quality aesthetic experience for those on the water.			
3599	" North Fork Sol Duc: An easy hike makes this river accessible as a day trip through wilderness for intermediate paddlers that can be enjoyed during the winter rainy season.			
3600				
3601	Paddlers who have enjoyed the wilderness rivers of the Park for the past several decades have developed a deep appreciation for the unique resources these rivers provide. While some rivers such as the Elwha are well-known classics, the wilderness setting and diversity of rivers allows individuals to find solitude and explore areas of the park where one can find new adventures and rivers to explore. Individuals have a unique opportunity to experience the sense of adventure akin to that of those who explored the Olympic wilderness prior to the creation of the Park. Jason Rackley, a paddler who has written extensively of his explorations in the Olympic wilderness, refers to the Park as one of the "last frontiers" for wilderness river exploration in the Pacific Northwest.			
3602				
3603	While we are a relatively small segment of backcountry users in the Park we recognize that all visitors have an impact on the environment. River exploration within the Park has similar impacts as hiking, backpacking, and backcountry fishing although use of a trail is one way with the river serving as the return route. We support continued management of backcountry users as outlined in the Draft GMP where hand-powered boating is recognized as a wilderness-compliant activity for all three wilderness zones. Some of the Park's rivers provide overnight opportunities but the majority of use is for day trips. An important element of our public education efforts focuses on establishing a wilderness ethic for paddlers who explore wilderness rivers. We regularly publish articles in our journal to educate paddlers on safety issues that must be considered on wilderness trips and the importance of practicing Leave No Trace principles including the need to carry rather than drag boats.			
3604				
3605	Comments on Roads Along Rivers			
3606				
3607	We recognize that roads provide important corridors for access into the Park. The problem is many of these roads pass through sensitive riparian areas and disrupt natural river function and processes. While the access that roads provide is important to recreational users including the constituency we represent, the impacts they have when they pass through channel migration zones can severely disrupt both ecological processes and aesthetic qualities of the river. Over the past 5 years we have seen new retaining walls, rip rap, and fill along the Quinault, Queets, Hoh, and Sol Duc. These highly engineered solutions distract from the very qualities that make these river such an incredible resource in a region where very few miles of undisturbed wild rivers remain. Convenient roadside access is available along several miles of river in Olympic National Forest and what makes the Park unique is the opportunity to have a wilderness river experience. Rivers in the Park should be managed to provide this experience.			
3608				
3609	While relocation of wilderness boundaries is a sensitive topic for discussion we believe it is appropriate to explore this option as a common-sense alternative to moving roads outside of the channel migration zone and onto more stable glacial terraces. This would only be acceptable under the condition that there would be no net loss of total wilderness. In some cases it may make sense to decommission roads and we support critical evaluation of this alternative, but in other cases where a public need for access is documented we would like to see alternate access routes outside the channel migration zone explored as an alternative. An excellent example where this alternative could be implemented is along the Queets River where a parallel road on National Forest lands could provide alternative access (see site specific comments below). Where feasible, moving roads out of channel migration zones, could provide a more stable road network that can be maintained and that will have reduced ongoing resource impacts such as we currently observe on rivers like the Hoh.			
3610				
3611	Alternative B offers an intriguing possibility for management of river floodplains along major west side rivers including the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault by establishing a "River Zone". We are supportive of this concept and believe it should be implemented along at least one of these rivers. Recent research, much of it conducted within the Park over the past decade, has significantly advanced our understanding of natural river function and process and the importance of floodplain connectivity. Historically we only considered the wetted channel when implementing management actions along river corridors. We now have a much great understanding of the dynamics of large floodplain rivers and the importance of these dynamics for river function, There are few rivers in the entire country where one can observe the natural processes that operate on these west side rivers. The Park has a responsibility to update current management practices to reflect our current scientific understanding of the importance of dynamic rivers for overall ecosystem health. In addition these rivers serve as critical natural laboratories that provide the knowledge informing management and restoration of rivers throughout the Pacific Northwest's temperate rainforest.			
3612				
3613	Comments on Wild and Scenic Rivers			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3614	A preliminary analysis has determined that 13 rivers or river segments are eligible for designation as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers system. These rivers include the Bogachiel River, Ozette River, Calawah River, Queets River, Dosewallips River, Quinault River, Duckabush River, Royal Creek, Elwha River, Skokomish River, Gray Wolf River, Sol Duc River, and Hoh River. An eligibility report has been completed for the Elwha River with the section from the mouth to Mills Reservoir found eligible following removal of Elwha and Glines Canyon Dams, and the section from Mills Reservoir to the headwaters eligible under current conditions. While an eligibility study has been completed for the Elwha, the Draft GMP states that "no formal eligibility studies have been conducted for the remaining eligible rivers& Further studies of eligibility will be conducted after completion of this general management plan, so this topic is dropped from further environmental analysis."			
3615				
3616	We are disappointed that the Draft GMP proposes to drop further analysis or recommendation of rivers, other than the Elwha, for inclusion in our nation's Wild and Scenic Rivers system. Many of the rivers identified clearly represent the nation's most appropriate candidates for Wild and Scenic designation, and an eligibility determination is necessary to complement planning efforts on Olympic National Forest. Given the importance of the Park's rivers to the public and their status as defining features of the Park, eligibility of Wild and Scenic Rivers should be one of the Park's highest priorities.			
3617				
3618				
3619	Wilderness			
3620				
3621	While our primary focus is on rivers we have a strong interest in their watersheds including the wilderness qualities of the landscape. A wilderness management plan for the Park needs to be completed. In general we find that the Park places an overemphasis on historic preservation and not enough emphasis on natural resource preservation and restoration For example the Park has focused recent efforts on replacing historic structures while ignoring the need to restore extirpated species such as wolves that have been successfully reintroduced in Yellowstone National Park and other places across the West. We believe the focus of Wilderness management should be on the restoration and preservation of the Park's ecosystems. Historical structures can be documented through narratives and photographs.			
3622				
3623	Visitor Services			
3624				
3625	Decisions on visitor services should recognize the fact that the Park is largely a wilderness area. The fact that there are no major cross-park roads that penetrate the interior of the Park is unique among the major National Parks of the West. New or expanded interpretation and education facilities should be developed outside the park for the benefit of local communities and the integrity of park resources.			
3626				
3627	Site Specific Comments and Recommendations			
3628				
3629	In addition to our general comments above we provide the following site specific recommendations corresponding to major river systems where we have an interest in future management.			
3630				
3631	Elwha			
3632	For almost two decades American Whitewater has been a stakeholder in the effort to remove Elwha and Glines Canyon dams. Removing these dams would restore one of the signature rivers of the Olympic Peninsula. We note that the Preferred Alternative states that "additional camping and hiking trails would be considered within the Elwha drainage (former Lake Mills)." While we are supportive of fully capitalizing on opportunities to highlight educational activities associated with this dam removal that will have national significance, we urge caution and support limitations on the level of infrastructure development so the public has an opportunity to see but not disrupt ecosystem recovery. For the short term we do not believe new camping areas are appropriate on lands exposed by draining the reservoir.			
3633				
3634	Quinault			
3635	The south park boundary upstream of Lake Quinault should be adjusted to include the full channel migration zone of the Quinault River. Adjusting the current park boundary would improve the ability to more effectively manage and protect elk populations that utilize the river floodplain. We believe a boundary adjustment along this river should be a long-term goal as parcels become available. The Finley Creek bridge should be removed or replaced with a more suitable solution. We support further exploration of alternatives to relocate roads outside of channel migration zones.			
3636				
3637	Queets River			

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
3638	3639	Currently there are parallel road networks within the Park and on National Forest lands. The Queets Road within the Park follows the river through the channel migration zone and across terraces composed of fine-grained sediments that are slumping into the channel. At the Matheny Creek river crossing the bridge is undersized and fill is replaced on a regular basis in an attempt to preserve this crossing. In contrast the Forest Road 21 and 2180 spur are paved, cross Matheny Creek along a section of the river that is bedrock controlled rather than alluvial, are well outside sensitive riparian areas, and pass within a mile of the Queets Road where a gated connector road could provide a potential alternative route into the Queets Campground and boat launch. The Park should seriously explore an alternative of decommissioning the Queets Road upstream of Hartzell boat launch and providing alternate access to the campground and boat launch through a partnership with the Forest Service utilizing Forest Road 21 and 2180.			
3640	3641	The Queets river offers the most significant opportunities for designation of a River Zone as outlined in Alternative B and we believe this alternative should be fully explored. We support the boundary adjustment on the north side of the river near Lyman Rapids as well as public and private partnerships to assist in comprehensive watershed protection efforts.			
3642	3643	Hoh We support exploration of alternatives to move the Hoh River Road out of the channel migration zone and potentially relocate visitor facilities. We believe there are significant opportunities for new interpretive facilities outside the river floodplain and this should be the long-term vision. Boundary adjustments to bring the confluence of the South Fork Hoh within the Park should be explored. As part of any effort to pursue this, public hike-in access to the confluence area from the south side should be considered.			
3644	3645	For many park visitors the Hoh is the gateway, and for some their only introduction, to the west side rivers and old-growth forests that line their banks. Because of this there are important public outreach opportunities. The Draft GMP notes that "outdated exhibits do not adequately present the key interpretive themes as they relate to the rainforest environment." We believe that there are significant opportunities to more effectively communicate the attributes of natural river systems. Interpretive trails at the Hoh River visitor center focus on mature forests but provide limited information on the river or the network of wall base channels and wetlands representing the past legacy of channel migration. For many visitors this may be their only opportunity to see a large floodplain river that is allowed to migrate across its floodplain and this is an important educational opportunity.			
3646	3647	Sol Duc River The preferred Alternative D retains seasonal road access that could be adjusted depending on weather. We wish to see access to Salmon Cascade through the first weekend in December. In some years the road is closed before any snow covers the first 7 mile segment of road up to Salmon Cascade. Through the period of fall and winter rains the Sol Duc River provides some of the best opportunities for a day trip on the water, and the river is well known as one with simple logistics. Closing the gate before snow covers the road significantly complicates logistics.			
3648	3649	Opportunities to move the road out of the channel migration zone, particularly in the area downstream of Salmon Cascade, should be explored. Highly engineered solutions to place the road along the side of the river have had a negative impact on the scenic qualities of this river.			
3650	3651	Conclusion			
3652	3653	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft GMP. We request that we remain on the mailing list for any future updates or opportunities for public input. We have greatly valued our relationship with Park staff. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions regarding public use of rivers in the Park.			
3654	3655	Sincerely,			
3656	3657	Thomas O'Keefe			
3658	3659	Pacific Northwest Stewardship Director			
3660	190716		Hurricane Ridge Winter	Port	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3661 3662	Our club would like to comment on the ONP Draft GMP/EIS as it pertains to Hurricane Ridge and Obstruction Point. We appreciate all the work that has gone into the planning process for Olympic National Park's future direction. Most of us have lived here for many years and have deep, strong attachments to this park and this beautiful country.	Sports Club	Angeles	
3663 3664	Our Club ran the downhill ski area at Hurricane Ridge for about 15 years before joining with the Hurricane Ridge Public Development Authority to run the area for the last several years. The latter is a public agency that had hoped to compete for the concession at the Hurricane Ridge lodge. The hope was tot have local input into that operation for the benefit of the local community, the park itself, and ultimately help make the ski area financially viable. Unfortunately, the opportunity to bid on that concession has not yet been afforded to us.			
3665 3666	Our ski area has a long history at Hurricane Ridge and before that at Deer Park. These operations precede the creation of Olympic National Park. We fully expect to continue operating our little ski area at Hurricane Ridge. At the same time we recognize the mission of the National Park Service and share the desire to preserve this area for future generations while enjoying the recreational opportunity we currently have.			
3667 3668	Therefore, we endorse Alternative D the Preferred Alternative as set forth in the Draft General Management Plan. We feel this alternative offers the best management strategy for Hurricane Ridge. We endorse winter road access for private vehicles on weekends, and allowing improvements to (but not expansion of) downhill ski support facilities.			
3669 3670	Olympic is a very special place and we appreciate the stewardship provided by the National Park Service. We hope to continue our mutually beneficial relationship.			
3671	188328			
3672 3673	Thank you for providing the opportunity for public comment on the Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Olympic National Park. This comment is submitted on behalf of the Hurricane Ridge Public Development Authority, which operates the ski area at Hurricane Ridge.	Hurricane Ridge Public Development Authority	Port Angeles	WA
3674 3675	We believe that the preferred alternative set forth in the Draft General Management Plan with regard to Hurricane Ridge area is a reasonable compromise of the various use alternative for that area. We encourage adoption of the preferred alternative for Hurricane Ridge in the final General Management Plan.			
3676 3677	We appreciate the opportunity to have previously commented on the planning for Hurricane Ridge and look forward to a mutally beneficial relationship with Olympic National Park.			
3678 3679 3680	Very truly yours, Steve Oliver, President Hurricane Rdige Public Development Authority			
3681	190940			
3682 3683	In response to the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (May 2006), following are responses to specific sections of the document that I believe requires closer attention.	U.S. Forest Service	Forks	WA
3684 3685	On page 35, reference is made in regards to 700 acres of land currently within the Olympic National Forest that are within the proposed boundary adjustments at Lake Crescent.			
3686 3687	Based on my review of the map on page M16 (Alternative D), there appears to be errors on the map showing what is National Forest. My review of the Pacific Ranger District and Forest maps show only approximately 80 acres in the proposed adjustments, not 700 acres. The rest appears to be private and State DNR lands.			
3688 3689	In addition, reference is made to these National Forest being transferred via a land exchange or would be recommended to be placed in a management status by the U.S. Forest Service that would be compatible with park purposes.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3690	This parcel on National Forest of approximately 80 acres is currently designated as Adaptive Management Area (AMA) under the Northwest Forest Plan. These areas are designated to encourage the development and testing of technical and social approaches to achieving desired ecological, economic, and other social objectives.			
3691				
3692	In addition, portions of streams pass through this National Forest parcel. Such riparian areas are designated as Riparian Reserves under the Northwest Forest Plan. These Reserves also require activities be in accordance with the standards and guidelines for this land designation. It may be that current standards and guidelines for this land designation meet the Park's purpose and objectives to ensure long-term protection of Lyre River and Lake Crescent species and habitat. I recommend you take this into consideration to make such a determination. If so, a management status as you recommend as an option may not be necessary if current management guidelines for National Forest are adequate to conserve species of interest.			
3693				
3694	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your Plan and EIS. I commend you on the excellent analysis conducted for this effort.			
3695				
3696	190703		Quinault	WA
3697	Area Specific Prescriptions (Wilderness)			
3698	I strongly support Alt. C, as it allows relocation of roads and maintenance of roads. We depend on the Quinault loop Road plus both East Fork and North Fork that have had problems in the past.			
3699				
3700	This is a very viable option for the trails and shelters. Some of the abandoned trails should be restored to spread people out plus let more people enjoy the area. This alternative also maintains and improves shelters, which are necessary for this country. The Enchanted Valley Chalet should be maintained and protected from the river, by all means. I believe historic buildings do have priority over wilderness classification anyway. Alt. C should also apply to the Queets.			
3701				
3702	Alt. A or C are the only options for the Quinault. Alt. B is certainly not! All three alternatives however have the same wording on acquiring private property on the Quinault. This is a situation that has caused a lot of hardship for the Quinault area. As you know, we had over 4,500 acres of private land when the park was established in 1938, with the Walgren Bill stating, "The residents shall have the same rights and privileges as they had before they were included in the Olympic National Park." However, we have less than 185 acres left and these people certainly were not allowed the use of the Walgren Bill.			
3703				
3704	The upper valley is essentially park now. The reason this land was so important to acquire, according to the park, was for elk habitat. This of course was not true, as the south shore is feeding most of the elk now, as they are grazing animals more than browsing and the south side fields are mowed and maintained.			
3705				
3706	The small acreage of private land that is left is certainly not elk habitat, as most of the land is on the plats and the houses are on lots close together. These are expensive homes and are desperately needed for taxes for our school. Our school has fallen from 325+ to 200+ due in a large part to this buying of homes. Many of these homes have been here for nearly 70 years. As they are not causing a problem, please let them stay.			
3707				
3708	We were told by the park in the 1970's that all private land acquired by the park there would be "in lieu of taxes" that would be paid to the school. This is quite a large amount of money, was this just "sugar coating" by the park or have they just forgotten to pay.			
3709				
3710	When Orlo Higley, sadly , had to sell to the park he was promised a visitor center at Kestner place with a true story of the early pioneers that settled the area, with the barn in in its original state, for tourists. The barn is gone, due to lack of care and there isn't any history of the area and Sharlene (Orlo's daughter) mentioned that the park has appeared to have lost many of the memorabilia that Higleys allowed them to have.			
3711				
3712	We have lived with the park as a neighbor for 68 years. The first 25 were fair, primarily due to Orlo Higley and the Walgren Bill. Then the park started applying pressure and making false promises and has become a very dangerous neighbor. It's like a wall between the residents and the Olympic National Park and as an American statesman once said, "take down this wall."			
3713				
3714	I request that this be made part of the official record.			
3715				
3716	190553		Quinault	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/Provin
2	Correspondence			
3717	I favor Alternative C, but could live with Alternative A.			
3718				
3719	That being said I would like to speak to issues of integrity, honesty, and the trustworthiness of Olympic National Park.			
3720				
3721	Olympic National Park has proven itself to be a very shameful "neighbor". It has used and abused the communities of Quinault, Amanda Park, and Neilton for many years. It has cost our school and these communities millions of dollars in lost revenue.			
3722				
3723	Its aggressive buy-out policy has robbed our school of hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax revenue. It has robbed our communities of millions of dollars by failing to repair damaged roads and failing to maintain campgrounds, trails, and shelters within the park itself.			
3724				
3725	It seems strange that the Open House schedule ignores Grays Harbor. What county adjacent to ONP is more overwhelmingly impacted by policy changes than ours? Where do the people of Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Montesano, and Elma, go to be presented with this information? Do they come to Amanda Park's tiny Timberland Regional Library? Not hardly. Is it unintentional that ONP scheduled only one Open House in Grays Harbor County? No, it wasn't. This was done to avoid a huge number of comments for approval of Alternatives A or C, which truly are the only alternatives offered for economic progress in our area.			
3726				
3727	Why does King County have an Open House? Their financial impact is of no significance in comparison to ours. It would not hurt the people of King County to have to drive two hours to an Open House when their comments are of a recreational significance only. Do you suppose they support Alternative A or C? Yeah, Right.			
3728				
3729	Are the citizens of our communities and the surrounding area being railroaded down a path favoring Alternatives B or D? You bet we are.			
3730				
3731	I could go on and on about the National Park Service's "trustworthiness", or lack of, but let me just finish with this. In "Quinault Alternative D Preferred Alternative", ONP has the insolence to say, "Partnerships would be encouraged with the local communities to provide additional opportunities". Lacking in political correctness let me say that Olympic National Park would be a Piss Poor Partner in any endeavor.			
3732				
3733	I request this be made a part of the official record.			
3734				
3735	191009		None Provided	N/A
3736	Plan C is our preferred plan. We could live with plan A or D also.			
3737				
3738	Plan B is absolutely insane. You guys need to steal more land like you need			
3739	another hole in your behinds!			
3740	190789		Tacoma	WA
3741	Retain the historical, archaeological, and cultural significance of the park. It is an important area not only for these reasons, but also public enjoyment. The public includes everyone, not just special interests concerned with environmental issues, but "ordinary" visitors. Access to all areas of the park should be for all persons. Support must be supplied by all. Charges for backcountry hikes and climbs should be increased to cover incidences which might occur requiring assistance of park personnel and/or local rescue people.			
3742	190798	Olympic Park Associates	Seattle	WA
3743	Olympic Park Associates appreciate this opportunity to comment on Olympic's Draft General Management Plan (GMP). We offer these comments in the sincere hope that they will lead to a sound plan and a positive future for this magnificent, world-renowned natural preserve.			
3744				
3745	As we stated in our scoping comments in 2001, we of OPA share a vision for the park that would protect and restore the outstanding natural and wilderness qualities for which Olympic National Park was established. These qualities are articulated in U.S. House of Representatives: House Report 2247, April 28, 1938 that accompanied creation of the park.			
3746				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
3747	3748	" ...preserve for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the people the finest sample of primeval forests...winter range and permanent protection for the herds of native Roosevelt elk and other wildlife indigenous to the area...conserve and render available to the people, for recreational use, this outstanding mountainous country...and a portion of surrounding verdant forest together with a narrow strip along the beautiful Washington coast."			
3749	3750	Our goal for Olympic National Park over the next 20 years is a fully restored ecosystem with its original components, processes and habitat functions intact. Human use would be managed to insure enjoyment of the park while protecting the healthy functioning of its ecosystems into the future. We believe, given the park's legal mandates and agency policies, that this should be your goal as well.			
3751	3752	As you know, much has changed since the park was established in 1938 or since the last management plan was completed in 1976. Olympic is no longer surrounded by vast areas of undisturbed forest. Roads, logging, and residential development of forest lands now define much of the park boundary. Increased recreational use of all types place demands on resources. Cumulative impacts on lower rivers and salmon streams and illegal hunting pressures have impacted park wildlife, fragmented habitats, and impaired ecosystem functions. Visitation to the park is increasing dramatically (doubling since the 1976 master plan). Added to this, climate change is already affecting hydrologic regimes and natural processes in the park and threatens to have major impacts on wildlife habitats from river systems to subalpine meadows.			
3753	3754	For a general management plan to deal with these kinds of threats to the future ecological integrity of the park, it must be bold, visionary, and encompass a broad view of Olympic's role in maintaining the larger Olympic ecosystem. Your 1976 master plan provided this kind of guidance for most of the past few decades. We feel the preferred alternative in the current draft falls woefully short.			
3755	3756	We appreciate and support those recommendations in the preferred alternative (D) that move the plan in this direction. Particularly, we support the establishment of intertidal reserves. This issue has been exhaustively discussed by the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary advisory committee. Recommending establishment of the reserves is a bold step, and one to which we hope you will remain committed.			
3757	3758	We support the park's intent to recommend boundary expansions to protect habitats for threatened and at risk wildlife populations. As you know, it will be up to Congress to legislate any additions to the park. We urge you to take a broad, long-term perspective on these recommendations and let the political process do the compromising.			
3759	3760	We strongly support a wilderness study for Ozette Lake, Pyramid Peak ridge, and future additions. Ozette is the last coastal wilderness lake outside Alaska and richly deserves protection. We support wild and scenic river designation for the Elwha, but we fear the significant expansion of the development zone in the valley works against watershed restoration.			
3761	3762	We support the Kalaloch Lodge, facilities, and highway relocation. And we support the park's intent to expand educational and interpretive programs, develop short interpretive trails, and encourage mass transit in high use areas. We request a shuttle be required on the Obstruction Point road during peak season to alleviate constant clouds of dust, parking overflow, and engine compartment temptations to marmots.			
3763	3764	All of these recommendation make a good start toward a GMP worthy of a World Heritage Site and international biosphere reserve.			
3765	3766	On the whole, however, we find the preferred alternative of the draft GMP to be lacking in the critical qualities mentioned above: boldness, vision, and sense of the park's place in the larger Olympic ecosystem.			
3767	3768	The draft is timid in its approach to resource protection, and many of its protective measures are compromised and inadequate to protect park resources into the future.			
3769	3770	Specifically, the preferred alternative (D):			
3771		offers inadequate measures for recovering threatened and endangered or at risk wildlife species			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3772				
3773	offers boundary expansions that fail to conform to watershed and topographic features, and are inadequate to protect and restore target wildlife populations			
3774				
3775	fails to protect irreplaceable habitats such as low elevation and floodplain forests, and offers inadequate protection for rivers, riparian areas, and critical salmon habitats			
3776				
3777	inordinately expands front country development zones far beyond current uses or any reasonable future use			
3778				
3779	favors roads and motorized access at the expense of fish and wildlife habitats			
3780				
3781	is overzealous in approach to cultural resource protection throughout the park, and			
3782				
3783	threatens the integrity of the Olympic Wilderness.			
3784				
3785	Further, we feel the draft plan misses the opportunity to address a number of larger issues that would insure sound ecosystem management in the face of an uncertain future. We ask park planners to reconsider these recommendations, outlined in our 2001 scoping letter, for inclusion in the final GMP.			
3786				
3787	an ecosystem study from which to base critical resource management decisions			
3788				
3789	a recommendation to reintroduce wolves into the Olympic National Park			
3790				
3791	wild and scenic river recommendations for at least 12 park rivers that qualify for congressional designation, and			
3792				
3793	a wilderness management plan that will address numerous controversial decisions regarding wilderness management in light of requirements of the Wilderness Act.			
3794				
3795	We will address these and other issues under some general headings. We will supply rationale where appropriate and recommend changes in the draft that may improve prospects for sound ecosystem management.			
3796				
3797	Wilderness			
3798				
3799	The discussion of desired conditions for wilderness in chapter 1 (p. 26) is flawed. The interpretation of "lower standards" as displayed in your matrix has been refuted by two recent U.S. federal court decisions, including Olympic Park Associates v. Mainella (2005). In that decision Judge Burgess found NPS managers guilty of "a clear error of judgment" in their interpretation of historic preservation in wilderness. The lower standards clause in no way gives priority to the National Historic Preservation Act or DOI or NPS administrative policies. Wilderness designation places "a new value" on the land, in Judge Burgess' words, i.e. a clear mandate to preserve wilderness character.			
3800				
3801	The plan states the NPS will maintain all existing and potential national register properties in wilderness. Appendix E lists "classified structures," to be maintained. Twenty-nine (by our count) are located in wilderness. This list includes at least one structure no longer standing. Another 21 are to be evaluated, "properties" that include some weathered piles of logs, an obsolete research facility, and a sawmill ruin. We have little doubt that all of these will make the cut.			
3802				
3803	For the GMP to decree that some fifty structures and eight "historic landscapes" (including the "USFS trail system") will be maintained in wilderness in a forthcoming wilderness management plan without addressing necessity under the Wilderness Act or their impacts on wilderness character is contrary to the Wilderness Act, NPS wilderness policies, and the scope of this plan.			
3804				
3805	Similarly, to zone the Olympic Wilderness into use zones, including some 500 miles of trails, campgrounds, primitive trails, and cross-county routes without providing any detail or specific rationale for is clearly beyond the scope of the present plan. We prefer the wilderness uses sketched in alternative B, but we are unable to comment on your alternatives for wilderness zoning due to the plan's lack of specific reference or rationale for these designations.			

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
3806		<p>The GMP seems to be attempting to make up for the park's lack of wilderness management plan by front loading several controversial decisions decisions that deserve full discussion of rationale and impacts in the current plan. This shorthand planning process shortchanges wilderness management and does a disservice to your wilderness planning effort. It will not meet a legal challenge.</p> <p>The GMP should direct the park to produce a wilderness plan that will guide management under the clear mandates of the Wilderness Act. If specific wilderness decisions are to be put forth in this plan, then a complete discussion of their legality under the Wilderness Act and impacts on wilderness character must be fully explored. Information on which the public can assess decisions affecting wilderness is nonexistent in the current draft GMP .</p> <p>Rivers</p> <p>With the increased frequency of flooding and resulting road washouts experienced by the park and national forest in recent years (possibly linked to global warming's effect on rain and snowfall regimes), river and road management deserve careful planning.</p> <p>The park's rivers provide habitat for 70 stocks of salmonids, a number of which are in decline and considered at risk by fishery managers (1992 Washington State Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory), as well as critical habitat for several special status fish.</p> <p>With salmon declines regionwide, rivers should be afforded the highest levels of protection. We urge you to reconsider your river protection zones (offered in Alternative B). Mitigative measures for all alternatives quoted on p. 76 include "Delineate 100 year floodplains and minimize development in these zones." This directive would seem to require that the river zone concept be incorporated into the preferred alternative. It is the only measure in the GMP that offers adequate protection for fish habitat and naturally sustainable river ecosystems, restricts bank armoring, and and protects the fisheries resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." We also ask that you review river reach analyses (done for several west end rivers) to identify future trouble spots in advance of flood events and plan road and transportation systems accordingly.</p> <p>The plan's assurance in the preferred alternative that roads will be maintained "using methods that minimize adverse effects on river processes and aquatic and riparian habitats, to the extent possible" fails to convince. In light of the recent rock armoring of the Sol Duc River Road without habitat mitigations, the park's insistence on reconstructing the Dosewallips Road regardless of impacts on critical habitat for federally listed threatened Puget Sound chinook, and the GMP's decision to continue destructive channelization of Finley Creek indefinitely, we have little confidence that future road reconstruction will be any different without strong protective measures made explicit in this plan.</p> <p>At the very least, we urge you to include language in your preferred alternative that will restore some of the protections offered by the river zones: "Prime fish and wildlife habitat will be protected in naturally sustainable river ecosystems" (p. 57). "Natural resources may be minimally but not permanently modified for access purposes" (p. 57). "River bank or meanders would not be hardened or altered. Natural flooding and hydrologic processes would be allowed to occur" (p. 57). And "The riparian and floodplain habitats of rivers, streams, and estuaraies would be protected" (p. 58).</p> <p>Salmon habitats have been and continue to be impaired by the park's road program. The GMP planning process offers the possibility to reevaluate in light of current scientific findings and change course. We are dismayed that the preferred alternative's emphasis on maintaining road access takes precedence over protecting one of the park's most threatened and irreplaceable resources, it's diversity of wild salmon stocks.</p> <p>We object to the draft's decision to continue the annual bulldozing of the Finley Creek channel. The Finley Creek situation would be aided by bridge removal and summer grading of the stream crossing during the dry season, as considered in an earlier EA. Again, the draft plan front loads a future planning effort with an unfortunate and short sighted decision. The current situation is harmful and unsustainable. Eventually, natural stream dynamics should be restored in this area.</p> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p>			
3807					
3808					
3809					
3810					
3811					
3812					
3813					
3814					
3815					
3816					
3817					
3818					
3819					
3820					
3821					
3822					
3823					
3824					
3825					
3826					
3827					
3828					

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3829	In our scoping comments OPA requested that park rivers be evaluated for eligibility for inclusion in the national Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and that the GMP make recommendations to Congress. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires federal agencies to study rivers for eligibility in their planning efforts. NPS management policies also require this (Section 2.3.1.10). We support the GMP's recommendation for the Elwha, but we are at a loss as to why the other eligible park rivers were not studied or considered.			
3830				
3831	The 1990 Olympic Forest Plan evaluated rivers for eligibility and made recommendations on rivers primarily in their jurisdiction. The forest service deferred to the park recommendations for rivers that were predominantly in the park's jurisdiction. We believe those evaluations are available for review and urge park planners to review them. We also request the Queets and other park rivers not reviewed by the forest service be evaluated in the final plan.			
3832				
3833	The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was passed in 1968. Olympic National Forest published its recommendations in 1990. The park service has had ample time to review the exceptional wild and free-flowing rivers in its jurisdiction and make recommendations to Congress. If the final GMP must be delayed to complete this obligation, it will be worth the effort.			
3834				
3835	Boundary adjustments			
3836				
3837	We commend the park service for planning for the future by recommending land additions in critical habitat areas to help protect wildlife species. We realize that these are controversial recommendations on the local level, but given impacts to park wildlife from destructive activities outside the park, we recognize that boundary adjustments are often the only way to insure permanent habitat protection.			
3838				
3839	The boundary adjustments offered in Alternative B appear to be informed by wildlife science, and we support them in every sense. Park managers should keep in mind that these are agency recommendations. Final boundary adjustments will result from congressional action and the political give and take that accompanies that process. Park recommendations should be sufficient to accomplish the objective of wildlife protection and ecosystem restoration.			
3840				
3841	Ozette Lake. The proposed boundary expansions for Ozette Lake in alternative B follow the hydrographic divide of tributaries making up the Ozette Lake watershed. The wisdom of including the entire watershed within the park allows restoration and planning activities to be determined by a single agency one dedicated to protecting natural systems. By removing abusive (albeit legal) logging practices that have resulted in siltation to the lake and its tributaries and harm to its threatened sockeye population, the advantage to the recovery process for Ozette Lake sockeye would be enormous. It would take years, possibly decades for the land to be acquired on a willing seller basis and restored to natural conditions. But the last wilderness coastal lake in the world would be fully protected, and park planners would have room to manage adequately for future uses.			
3842				
3843	The addition recommended in the preferred alternative fails to address the impacts of industrial logging on the Ozette watershed. While an improvement over current boundaries, proposed boundaries do not make sense ecologically, and by allowing continued logging abuses in the basin, they offer little hope for ecosystem restoration for the Ozette watershed.			
3844				
3845	We cannot endorse the proposed land acquisition and exchange with Washington's Department of Natural Resources. More details would be needed to fully evaluate this proposal, but turning federally purchased land over to the kind of maximum timber harvest practiced by the DNR without the minimum ecological protections assured by Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification is self defeating. The timber industry certification offered represents the same kind of abusive forest practices that condemned the Ozette sockeye to the endangered species list in the first place. It is disturbing that the National Park Service is advocating such a measure.			
3846				
3847	Lake Crescent. The fortunes of the Cresecenti and Beardslee trout of Lake Crescent have been dire in recent years. Both populations declined markedly during the 1990s with Beardslee numbers dropping below 100 in 2000. Major impacts to both fish's spawning areas in the Lyre River occurred when a 1997 slope failure resulting from logging steep unstable ground in the Boundary Creek drainage sent thousands of tons of sediment into Boundary Creek and the Lyre River drainages.			
3848				
3849	Expanding the park boundary north at Lake Crescent to include critical spawning reaches of the Lyre River and all of the Boundary Creek drainage (as recommended in Alternative B) would ensure that critical spawning habitat for these fish would be protected. Most of Boundary Creek is already in federal (forest service) ownership. Additional private acquisitions beyond the preferred alternative would be modest.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3850	By offering inadequate protection for the Boundary Creek watershed, the preferred alternative opens the door to further impacts of Lyre River spawning areas. With the reduced Beardslee and Crescent numbers of recent years, this does not insure the future of these unique fish.			
3851				
3852	Quinault. The modest adjustment of the south boundary to include the rivers floodway would be an improvement, insuring comprehensive management of the river zone. We're aware, however, that prospects for armed insurrection in the area must be taken into account.			
3853				
3854	Queets and Hoh. We endorse the inclusion of the northern drainage of the lower Queets River within the park as proposed in Alternative B. to protect important seasonal habitat for Roosevelt elk and coho salmon habitat. The addition would afford much more protection for the compromised Queets corridor, and more than the modest boundary adjustment offered in the preferred alternative.			
3855				
3856				
3857				
3858	The South Fork Hoh River. Wouldn't that be nice.			
3859	Developed areas			
3860				
3861	The development zone standards and the size of development zones in the preferred alternative are entirely out of scale for a wilderness park like Olympic. Descriptions of development zones should be scaled down to comply with current uses at Olympic, and development zones should be expanded only when there is no other way to accommodate necessary visitor services outside the park.			
3862				
3863	Development zones in Olympic should accommodate campgrounds of no more than 100 sites (200 for Kalaloch). The 250 campsite figure (which more than triples the size of some of your largest campgrounds) is wildly out of scale with current and projected needs at Olympic. Campground expansion, where it occurs, should emphasize tent and small vehicle camping, leaving the accommodation of large, self-contained recreational vehicles to commercial facilities outside the park. It is unwise to sacrifice low-elevation, floodplain and old-growth forests, where most campgrounds are sited, in order to accommodate large, polluting, noise generating RVs.			
3864				
3865	The preferred alternative's dramatic expansions of developed zones at Elwha (two miles along the Elwha River Road and a mile of Lake Mills shoreline), Sol Duc (one-half mile of floodplain west-northwest of the resort), and Hoh (approximately 300 acres of old-growth temperate rainforest north of the visitor center) are both worrisome and baffling. No justification for this level of increased development is offered in the draft, or any indication of the types of development (existing services or new commercial development) is given. Further, no acreages for these zones are provided, thus limiting the public's ability to evaluate these proposals. A simple table comparing acreages for these zones for the various alternatives would be extremely helpful.			
3866				
3867	These zone expansions represent a radical departure from existing uses and a level of future development inappropriate for a natural preserve like Olympic. As we suggested in our scoping letter, development on this scale should be located outside the park where local communities can reap the economic benefits of providing visitor services.			
3868				
3869	Proposed development expansion in the Elwha is particularly troubling given the effort and expense being undertaken for dam removal and ecosystem restoration. One of the conditions that helped drive the restoration was the pristine nature of the watershed inside the park. With dam removal imminent, is this the time to alter the natural conditions of the watershed with miles of expanded development zone for the Elwha? We think not.			
3870				
3871	We commend the park on its decision to remove the Kalaloch development away from the coastal area. We urge moderation in planning replacement facilities.			
3872				
3873	Extirpated species			
3874				
3875	Restoring extirpated species should be a high priority for the park. We suggest that "Reintroduce extirpated special status species" be added to mitigative measures on p. 77, and that the restoration of extirpated species become a desired condition for the future of the park. We appreciate the park's cooperation with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's effort to restore fisher to Olympic National Park. It would be appropriate for the GMP to give guidance and approval to this restoration.			
3876				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3877	Similarly, a good case has been made for wolf reintroduction at Olympic. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's 1999 feasibility study for wolf reintroduction found that there was sufficient prey and habitat to support at population of some 50 plus wolves in the Olympics. An earlier survey by Defenders of Wildlife found the idea was popular on and off the peninsula.			
3878				
3879	The experience at Yellowstone has demonstrated the tremendous power of ecosystem revitalization brought about by wolf reintroduction. The same could be true for Olympic, particularly regarding coyote population control and reducing coyote predation on declining marmot populations. In time, wolf reintroduction could stand beside Elwha River ecosystem restoration as the capstone of a revitalized ecosystem. We request the GMP provide guidance that wolf restoration be a desired natural resource condition and recommend reintroduction.			
3880				
3881	Non-native species			
3882				
3883	The park's draft environmental impact statement on non native mountain goats has been in limbo for more than a decade. Our members have reported increasing numbers of goats in many areas of the park, obvious goat damage to plant communities and have witnessed goat human interactions at several locations. In short, the goat problem is once more rearing its horny head.			
3884				
3885	We understand your reticence to offer management direction for goats in this document. But your discussion of nonnative species (p. 111-112) is wholly lacking in direction for any nonnative wildlife. The park has a recognized mandate to manage nonnative populations and where appropriate, remove them. This issue requires a much fuller discussion in the Final EIS.			
3886				
3887	Conclusion			
3888				
3889	While the DEIS offers considerable discussion of balancing resource needs with human use, we find the plan is distinctly out of balance. The preferred alternative displays a pronounced bias toward motorized access, increased development, and a preoccupation with cultural resource protection. On nearly every critical issue, natural resource protection is compromised to accommodate the above uses. Habitat needs of special status species are too-often ignored, and wilderness protection is compromised by peremptory management decisions.			
3890				
3891	An example of this bias is evident in development zones. Nearly all the expanded development zones in alternative C (visitor opportunities emphasis) have been included in your preferred alternative (Hoh is much larger in the preferred, though Kalaloch is slightly smaller). In contrast very few of the natural resource protections offered in alternative B appear in the preferred unaltered. Ecological boundary adjustments, river zone, and "primeval" wilderness zone have been compromised or dropped. At the same time, radical cultural resource protections (blanket preservations of "classified" lists of structures and landscapes) are treated as sacrosanct.			
3892				
3893	Similarly, we find the draft's analysis of impacts of the preferred alternative inadequate and lacking in clarity. Language such as found in your conclusion of impacts on hydrologic systems, "Implementing alternative D would have a long-term moderate beneficial effects and long-term minor to moderate adverse effects on hydrologic systems" (p. 315) is not useful.			
3894				
3895	OPA would like to see a final plan that is indeed balanced, and affords natural resources the protections needed to insure that a healthy ecosystem can survive the challenges of the coming decades.			
3896				
3897	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the plan.			
3898	191243	Peninsula Citizens for the Protection of Whales	Port Angeles	WA
3899	My comments will concern a topic not mentioned in the Draft. I did attend the open house in Port Angeles and asked whether it was a moot point to comment on an issue not referred to. The answer was: "Please comment on anything!"			
3900				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3901	So - in a nutshell: many people are concerned about various potential impacts of a revived Makah Whale hunt. The issue is now "on hold" as the NMFS/NOAA prepares a court-ordered EIS. However there is a fair likelihood that whale hunting will resume in the near future. The preferred timing and location of whale hunting by the Tribe could and has varied from "no time or area restrictions" to "fall-winter-spring hunts on the outer coast." In either scenario there will likely be whales pursued, harpooned, and shot at with a 50 calibre anti tank gun in the near-shore waters just off the park wilderness beaches from Shi Shi to the Norweigan Monument. The whale shot in 1999 was taken within a half mile of the beach near Father and Son Rock. As that whale was being shot at from a motorized boat, several bullets missed and flew off through the air. Toward shore? Maybe.			
3902				
3903	Ballistics expert Roy Kline testified to the 9th Circuit Court that a .50 cal bullet can travel many miles on a missed or ricocheted shot. That undisputed testimony caused NMFS/NOAA to withdraw support for a hunt area inside the Straits of Tongue Point based on the danger to the public. Public safety trumped the Tribe's desire to hunt in the calm near-shore waters of the Strait.			
3904				
3905	The same danger exists for Park visitors camping or hiking on the wilderness coastal strip.			
3906				
3907	This information was given to Supt. Dave Morrise in 2001. We had a good dialogue on the topic & it was suggested to him that the Park express safety concerns to the NMFS EIS process. He agreed that would be appropriate.			
3908				
3909	The issue of Treaty rights and Park safety would be resolved if the Makah Whale hutns of the future took place at least five miles off shore. That would place the hunt in the migratory corridor while keeping the .50 cal weapon at a safe distances from the Park.			
3910				
3911	We recommend immediate communications of these concerns to NMFS/NOAA. A "big game hunt" with a big gun has no place within range of our wilderness park area.			
3912				
3913	Thank you for your consideration of this issue.			
3914	190528		Marcola	OR
3915	Good Morning,			
3916				
3917	One of the main reason I visit the Olympic peninsula is to take in a soak in the natural hot water of Olympic Hot Springs. I enjoy using them I the Nude.			
3918				
3919	I feel that the area should be left as it is The Naturists in the area are doing a good job of maintaining the area and it has been being used as a naturist soaking area for decades.			
3920				
3921	Please don't proceed forward with any of your proposals.			
3922	190920		Bellevue	WA
3923	Letter on File			
3924	191256		Seattle	WA
3925	I am a Seattle resident and have been enjoying visits to the Lake Ozette area for many years. I have recently heard of possible plans by the Park Service to acquire additional land around Ozette. I am puzzled and alarmed. A great deal of this land has already been clar cut. To call it wilderness is a joke. It sounds as if the only ones to profit from this acquisition are the timber companies, certainly not the people who wish to continue to have access to public and private land around Lake Ozette.			
3926				
3927	Our parks were established for the use of the public. If the park acquires additional land use of hte lake will be restricted. I hear that those who own land around the lake don't want to sell. I also understand that the land will be removed from the tax roles costing Clallam County and Washington State school funds. As a public school teacher I know no district can afford further loss of funding.			
3928				
3929	Please, I strongly urge you to oppose alternatives B, C, and D for the Ozette area. I disagree with boundary adjustments around Ozette. Please support alternative A, which changes nothing.			
3930	190558		Keaau	HI
3931	Dear Olympic National Park planners,			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3932	We are writing to comment on the ONP General Management Plan Draft EIS. We have spent at least a month every summer for the past 4 years, exploring its many special areas. We have spent much time in our extraordinary national parks over our lifetimes, and can honestly say that Olympic is our lifetime favorite, for its wide range of largely undisturbed ecosystems'particularly old-growth forests and vibrant rivers'and its relative lack of development compared to other parks.			
3933	We applaud several recommendations of the preferred alternative, including the establishment of much-needed marine reserves along sensitive intertidal areas; expansion of park boundaries around the Ozette basin, Lake Crescent, and the Queets River corridor; the expansion of educational and interpretive programs to help visitors understand and appreciate park resources better; and recognition of the need to encourage mass transit in heavily used developed areas.			
3934	Unfortunately, several other recommendations in the preferred alternative (D) threaten the park's ecological integrity by placing developed recreation and motorized access over natural resource protection and species restoration. We have categorized our comments as follows.			
3935	Rivers : The park's rivers are some of its most precious assets. Twelve rivers within park boundaries qualify for Wild and Scenic River designation, yet only designation for the Elwha is recommended; no eligibility study for the others are included in the proposed plan. From personal experience with rivers in California, we know that designation confers stronger protection and recognition than any other legal measure, and the park's rivers need and deserve to be studied for designation. Likewise, while many of the park's rivers provide critical habitat for a number of federally listed threatened and endangered salmon stocks, as well as sustenance for countless other species, the preferred alternative neglects to provide for riparian protection zones that would confer an extra degree of safeguarding. We urge you to include recommendations for initiating river protection zones and studies for Wild and Scenic designation for at least the major rivers in the park, including the Sol Duc, Quinalt, Queets, and Hoh.			
3936				
3937	Development and Expansion: One of the nicest features of the ONP is its relatively small commercial footprint. We are opposed to any further expansion of commercial concessions within the park. In our opinion, the services already there are adequate, and expanding commercial opportunities runs counter to the purposes of protecting the natural resources for their own sake and for human enjoyment. Commercial concessions are out of control in many parks (such as Yosemite and the Grand Canyon) and they sully the natural experience of those parks. Park visitors can get all their needs met with the current facilities and businesses and at the nearby towns and villages. Likewise, we see little need for expanding campgrounds, such as the huge enlargement envisioned for the Sol Duc campground. We have never been unable to find a camp spot, even in the middle of summer. Expansion projects are very costly, and its common knowledge that Park Service budgets are woefully tight. Precious funds should be spent on protecting, studying and enhancing park resources, and maintaining existing infrastructure and the quality of the park experience. We urge you to refrain from any commercial expansion unless a thorough study shows a str			
3938				
3939	Our understanding is that some of the proposed boundary expansions do not conform to actual watershed boundaries and are inadequate to protect downstream fish species from destructive upstream activities like timber harvest and road building. We urge you to revisit the boundaries issue and adjust the proposed expansions to reflect these needs.			
3940				
3941	Wilderness and Ecosystems: We find it disturbing that to date, 18 years after designation of the Olympic Wilderness, no wilderness management plan has been completed. This, and an overall park ecosystem study are logically the first fundamental steps in crafting a plan that will set the course for the park for the next 15-20 years. The proposed park plan includes several controversial decisions impacting wilderness, such as moving wilderness boundaries on active floodplains to maintain problem roads and maintaining and restoring up to 50 historic structures in designated wilderness. How can such decisions be made without a management plan in place that adheres to the principles and goals of wilderness areas as outlined in the Wilderness Act?			
3942				
3943	Campground Fire Policy: Over the last few years we have found smoke levels in the campgrounds throughout the park becoming insufferable. It seems everyone has to build a campfire (even folks in RVs) and wet wood is their fuel. Trees close in the sites and air circulation is poor. No doubt these conditions would trigger federal air quality alerts were they to occur in a monitored area. We ourselves have come back from our park trips with respiratory infections. One can only imagine the damage this smokiness does to children (we are seeing childhood asthma rates skyrocketing nationwide) and older folks, not to mention so-called healthy individuals. We have complained to numerous park personnel and they always tell us they agree and we should voice our concerns to the superintendent (we have done so).			
3944	It's time for park planners to respond proactively to the need for people to have clean air where they camp. We urge you to dedicate sections of all campgrounds as no campfire areas, and monitor them to be sure they are ample enough to meet the demand. We also urge you to post signage about how to build a fire properly to keep smoke to a minimum and listing the dangers of smoke inhalation, to increase the public's awareness. ONP could be the leader on this park service policy change!			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3945	Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the plan. We hope to enjoy many more trips to the Olympic National Park.			
3946	190709		None Provided	N/A
3947	We both strongly believe that the greater emphasis should be on preserving the park as a wild ecosystem. Thank you.			
3948	191005		Port Angeles	WA
3949	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the ONP/GMP.			
3950	As a resident of Port Angeles I am a regular beneficiary of			
3951	all that Olympic National Park offers. It is a remarkable resource,			
3952	but one that should be left alone, and not mined.			
3953				
3954	I feel the preferred alternative (D) does not provide adequate vision			
3955	or protection for the Park for the following reasons:			
3956				
3957	* inadequate measures for recovering threatened and endangered or			
3958	at-risk wildlife species			
3959				
3960	* boundary expansions that fail to conform to watershed and			
3961	topographic features, and are inadequate to protect and restore target			
3962	wildlife populations			
3963				
3964	* fails to protect irreplaceable habitats such as low-elevation and			
3965	floodplain forests, and offers inadequate protection for rivers,			
3966	riparian areas, and critical salmon habitats			
3967				
3968	* inordinately expands front country development zones far beyond			
3969	current uses or any reasonable future use!			
3970				
3971	* favors roads and motorized access at the expense of fish and			
3972	wildlife habitats			
3973				
3974	* is overzealous in approach to cultural resource protection			
3975	throughout the park, and			
3976				
3977	* threatens the integrity of the Olympic Wilderness.			
3978				
3979	The draft plan also fails to address these issues that would provide			
3980	necessary protection			
3981	for the future of the park:			
3982				
3983	* an ecosystem study from which to base critical resource management			
3984	decisions			
3985				
3986	* wild and scenic river recommendations for at least 12 park rivers			
3987	that qualify for congressional designation, and			
3988				
3989	* a wilderness management plan that will address numerous			
3990	controversial decisions regarding wilderness management in light of			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
3991	requirements of the Wilderness Act.			
3992				
3993	There are many pressures the park will face in the near future. This			
3994	Plan is an opportunity			
3995	to protect the park so that it can function as a wilderness area. I			
3996	do not believe Alternative			
3997	D provides adequate protection for this remarkable resource.			
3998	191006		Port Angeles	WA
3999	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the ONP/GMP.			
4000	As a resident of Port Angeles I am a regular beneficiary of			
4001	all that Olympic National Park offers. It is a remarkable resource,			
4002	but one that should be left alone, and not mined.			
4003				
4004	I feel the preferred alternative (D) does not provide adequate vision			
4005	or protection for the Park for the following reasons:			
4006				
4007	* inadequate measures for recovering threatened and endangered or			
4008	at-risk wildlife species			
4009				
4010	* boundary expansions that fail to conform to watershed and			
4011	topographic features, and are inadequate to protect and restore target			
4012	wildlife populations			
4013				
4014	* fails to protect irreplaceable habitats such as low-elevation and			
4015	floodplain forests, and offers inadequate protection for rivers,			
4016	riparian areas, and critical salmon habitats			
4017				
4018	* inordinately expands front country development zones far beyond			
4019	current uses or any reasonable future use!			
4020				
4021	* favors roads and motorized access at the expense of fish and			
4022	wildlife habitats			
4023				
4024	* is overzealous in approach to cultural resource protection			
4025	throughout the park, and			
4026				
4027	* threatens the integrity of the Olympic Wilderness.			
4028				
4029	The draft plan also fails to address these issues that would provide			
4030	necessary protection			
4031	for the future of the park:			
4032				
4033	* an ecosystem study from which to base critical resource management			
4034	decisions			
4035				
4036	* wild and scenic river recommendations for at least 12 park rivers			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4037	that qualify for congressional designation, and			
4038				
4039	* a wilderness management plan that will address numerous			
4040	controversial decisions regarding wilderness management in light of			
4041	requirements of the Wilderness Act.			
4042				
4043	There are many pressures the park will face in the near future. This			
4044	Plan is an opportunity			
4045	to protect the park so that it can function as a wilderness area. I			
4046	do not believe Alternative			
4047	D provides adequate protection for this remarkable resource.			
4048	188613		Vancouver	BC
4049	Please keep the hot springs open - surely there must be other options besides removing them... improvements?			
4050				
4051	I always look forward to visiting the hot springs on my trips to the USA.			
4052				
4053	188466		Beaver	WA
	I am basically opposed to encroachment by the park and don't understand why we change so much especially in these times of financial instability. But to start with Hurricane Ridge, Alternative D - let's make a ski resort. Deer Park Alt A seems okay as is. Dose Alt B - no need to rebuilt road, but leave the campground alone. Staircase Alt A. Elwha Alt A why go in and mess with the Hot Springs, leave them alone. Lake Crescent, the North Shore trail should be left as is. Period. The NODT people are part of the group that wants to pave the world. Sol Duc Alt A. Ozette is another can of worms, I can almost understand the need for expansion, but boats should continue to allowed as is. Hoh Alt. A.			
4054				
4055	190905		Clallam Bay	WA
	Keep Ozette alternative A current management. Do something about the sea lions and sea otters what are killing most of the fish what do up the Ozette river. Get some fish in the Lake so people can catch a fish and being able to keep them. Put in more cmaping spot on Lake, also pu camping spot on Erickson Bay on Lake Ozette. Put a floating dock at Swar			
4056	Bay on older people could get into a boat a lot easier. Do something about all the trees what are dieing around Lake Ozette.			
4057				
	Take out some of the blow down timber with helicopter and pile the limbs and replant some and make the park look better. It woudl give the park some money. They are always			
4058	saying they don't have any money.			
4059				
	The park sure now how to charge people to get into park, park your car and camping. Maybe if they sold some timber, what blowed down you wouldn't have to charged people so			
4060	much for everything.			
4061				
4062	You don't keep the trails up very good anymore.			
4063				
4064	The park has lots of money to build new buildings and get new equipment, but can't fix camping spots or trails.			
4065				
	When they ahd a meeting at Sekiu School House which as a sign saying no firearms, why does the park ranger has to have his gun on at a meeting. In my thinking it makes the			
4066	park look bad. I hate to ask people with a gun any questions.			
4067				
	Let people use motor boats on lake Ozette. If you only let canoes and kayaks on lake that's not being fair to the other people with motor boats. Like to see the park accept Ozette			
4068	Alternative A - current management.			
4069	190915		Clallam Bay	WA
4070	Letter on File			
4071	190923		Sequim	WA
4072	Letter on File			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4073	190997		Seattle	WA
4074	The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement			
4075	(GMP/EIS) for Olympic National Park details four alternatives that are			
4076	presented for public comment . . . these alternatives broadly			
4077	categorized as:			
4078				
4079	· Current Management (Alternative A)			
4080				
4081	· Resource Protection Emphasis (Alternative B)			
4082				
4083	· Visitor Opportunities Emphasis (Alternative C), and			
4084				
4085	· the Park's management Preferred Alternative (D)			
4086				
4087				
4088				
4089	In all the alternatives to the current management (A) that are			
4090	suggested and presented for public comment, the "visitor constructed" hot spring pools at Olympic Hot Springs would be removed and the area restored to a "natural" state. I would			
4091	like to make a couple of comments on the proposed alternatives as regards the Olympic Hot			
4092	Springs site, and then offer approaches that can be explored to keep the hot spring site as a visitor soaking experience while ameliorating			
4093	some of the objections to continued use.			
4094				
4095	The Draft GMP/EIS document assesses three benefits of Olympic Hot Springs restoration, and one adverse impact. The three plan-stated			
4096	benefits presented in all three alternatives to the current management are:			
4097				
4098	1. Hydrologic Systems: The restoration of Olympic Hot Spring by removing the human constructed facilities in the area would result			
4099	in minor to moderate beneficial effects to the hydrologic systems in that area by restoring natural processes.			
4100				
4101	2. Soils: Rehabilitation of the Olympic Hot Springs would result in improved soil conditions through the restoration of areas			
4102	damages by social trails and by restoring the natural process to the area. These actions would result in long-term moderate beneficial			
4103	impact on soils.			
4104				
4105	3. Vegetation: The restoration of the Olympic Hot Springs to natural conditions would result in localized long-term, minor beneficial effects as native vegetation returns to the site and			
4106	natural processes are restored.			
4107				
4108	While Water-based Recreational Opportunities are increased park-wide (including an expansion of the Sol Duc facilities) under the Visitor			
4109	Opportunities Emphasis alternative, restoration of Olympic Hot Springs to a natural state is listed as a minor to moderate adverse impact of			
4110	those visitors that utilize this area for bathing.			
4111				
4112				
4113	Under a "resource protective" approach, these rationales make sense and are valid should the park's management accept and adopt that approach. However, Alternative C (the			
4114	Visitors Opportunities Emphasis) would seem to argue for the continued or increased opportunities inherent in a properly-controlled or managed Olympic Hot Springs site . . . not			
	against them.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4115	Olympic Hot Springs are enormously popular amongst park visitors. It is reasonably easy to get to, requires but a short, level hike and gives park visitors an opportunity to participate rather than observe the wonders of these natural processes. The parking at the trailhead can easily accommodate a couple of dozen			
4116	vehicles, which on nice weekends I would confidently guess that a very large percentage are there to visit the springs as opposed to hike-through backpacking.			
4117				
4118	Hot springs are a natural draw to visitors as can be attested to in the numerous postings in all the major outdoor forums. In the Pacific Northwest region the State of Washington has only three reasonably-accessible natural hot springs, those being:			
4119				
4120				
4121	· Olympic Hot Springs			
4122				
4123	· Baker Hot Springs (on National Forest property)			
4124				
4125	· Goldmyer Hot Springs (private, non-profit conservancy)			
4126				
4127				
4128	The other hot springs are either inaccessible due to remoteness (Gamma and Sulphur HS) or restricted due to property concerns:			
4129				
4130	· Garland (private property mineral claim)			
4131				
4132	· Scenic (private property)			
4133				
4134	· Lester (watershed protection)			
4135				
4136	· Ohnahpanosh (reverted on Rainier National Park)			
4137				
4138	· Wind River (only reasonable access is through private property)			
4139				
4140				
4141	By contrast, the states of California, Oregon, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Idaho and the province of British Columbia have numerous, publicly-accessible natural hot springs on mainly federal land (crown land in BC) or in private in-holding that are available for the unique experience of soaking in a hot spring pool. To take away one of the few remaining soaking opportunities further distances the State of Washington from the unique recreation options the Pacific Northwest has to offer. A few other thoughts:			
4142				
4143	· Historically: There was a resort there once and to totally revert this back to natural breaks any connection with that important			
4144	and early history of Washington State;			
4145				
4146	· Popularity, Desire and Easy Access: There is no doubt of these facets that bring so many people up to Olympic to enjoy the hot			
4147	springs. Even for the uninitiated, natural hot springs magically fascinate and draw people to enter the park (and pay the Park entrance			
4148	fees) for just that reason. It is a draw that even low-income citizens can enjoy;			
4149				
4150	· Fiscally: If a management-style approach is established to control the undesirable aspects of the present situation, less Ranger presence would be needed. There is potential for excess revenue to fund other park resources;			
4151				
4152	· Culturally: The management plan speaks often (and very positively) of the adjoining Indian Reservations and the cultural			
4153	significance these tribes exert over the decisions made in the plan. Hot springs hold high cultural importance to Native Americans. There is a long tradition to soaking in natural hot			
4154	springs. Most non-Native Americans are touched spiritually and philosophically by an			
4155	experience a Native American understands intrinsically. We should protect, preserve and honor this very important cultural tradition.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4156	In consideration of the above, I do not consider the removal of the Olympic Hot Springs site from visitor soaking opportunities to be in			
4157	the best interests of the citizens of the State of Washington (in which this great park is located), nor to the tourists and park			
4158	visitors who often visit the area and get the opportunity to enjoy the experience in soaking in a natural hot spring.			
4159				
4160	Other Approaches			
4161				
4162				
4163	I met with the Park Superintendent and the Head Ranger during the Seattle REI Open House event on August 24 th of this year and spoke with them both at length over the future			
4164	of Olympic Hot Springs. What I took back with me from that meeting is perhaps a truer underpinning			
4165	of the reasons behind the decision to "write" Olympic Hot Springs out of the Park's list of assets . . . at least as far as the opportunity			
4166	to soak in the waters that many visitors seek out for a multitude of reasons.			
4167	I have been associated with hot springs (both natural and developed) for a number of years in a personal and consultive-capacity:			
4168				
4169	· Actively involved with the new owner of Scenic Hot Springs in surveying and permitting of the spring property,			
4170				
4171	· Involved in confidential hot spring locating for a First Nation government in BC treaty negotiations,			
4172				
4173	· Involved in feasibility studies with NWForests.org for Austin HS in Oregon			
4174				
4175	· Provided technical advice to Brietenbush HS during the geothermal well relining of 2004.			
4176				
4177				
4178	I also maintain close contacts with interested parties throughout the west coast on concerns regarding natural hot springs. My experience			
4179	provide me with an idea of the problems land owners face when a natural hot spring exists on their property. Olympic Hot Springs is			
4180	no different from many other, poorly-managed or unmanaged hot springs with user-built pools. Sanitation, safety and poor environmental			
4181	practices lead to a very unsatisfactory situation in short course.			
4182				
4183				
4184	Olympic Hot Springs suffers from too many user-built pools with insufficient water-flow to keep e.coli counts down (the same situation			
4185	applies at Baker Hot Springs). Additionally, because of the easy access there is no 'outdoor' mindset to many visitors who consider the			
4186	place their private party zone. Because of the numerous and unabated pool construction (I counted 21 at one time) the bench upon which the			
4187	site sits has become a quagmire of wet soils and, as the reports states, a network of 'social trails?'. To any responsible hot spring			
4188	enthusiast, the situation is untenable . . . but to revert the site instead of managing it is tantamount to "throwing the baby out with			
4189	the bathwater".			
4190				
4191	At the very least, the number of pools needs to be decreased to meet two and one half hour recharge times. The pools need to be rebuilt			
4192	with cleaning in mind (drains, grouting). Social trails should be discouraged with boardwalks and drainage patterns from the pool			
4193	outflow established to stabilize the bench area.			
4194				
4195				
4196	An ideal solution would be to hire or contract a management service like HooDoo Recreation Services. Hoodoo manages the natural hot spring pool at Cougar Hot Springs in			
4197	Oregon for the National Forest Service. The owner has expressed an interest in Olympic and I'd be			
4198	more than willing to make introductions.			
4199	Beyond that, I stand ready to answer any questions you might have.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4200				
4201	Thank you for your time.			
4202	189421	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington - Pierce County Chapter	None Provided	N/A
4203	I am the current president of the Pierce County Chapter of The Backcountry Horsemen of Washington. As such I feel that it is my obligation to encourage the use of equine on all trails that have traditionally been open to stock use, including those located in the Olympic National Park.			
4204				
4205	Horsemen not only have the opportunity to enjoy the majesty of the backcountry but do much to establish and maintain the trails for all users. We strongly encourage and practice the Leave No Trace ethic, knowing full well the fragility of the pristine meadows, trails and camp sites of the high country.			
4206				
4207	It is our strongest desire that all trails that are in the Olympic Park Wilderness Area which are open to stock should remain open to stock in the Olympic National Park General Management Plan and not be zoned as either primitive wilderness zone or primeval wilderness zone.			
4208				
4209	Your considered judgement on this important matter will be appreciated by many generations to come.			
4210	190934		Klamath Falls	OR
4211	I have spent 1-2 weeks hiking and wilderness camping			
4212	in the Olympic National Park coastal wilderness for			
4213	the last 14 years. I have a degree in wildlife			
4214	biology and knowledge of public lands management [and			
4215	bio-politics!] after 32 years with U.S. Fish and			
4216	Wildlife Service as a Refuge Manager, GS-14.			
4217				
4218	My wife, Kirsten, and I strongly endorse Alternative			
4219	B.			
4220				
4221	We want [a] existing wilderness better maintained and			
4222	increased when opportunities arise, [b]hiking trails			
4223	maintained better, [c] more wilderness rangers to			
4224	better educate and protect visitors, wilderness and			
4225	wildlife, [d] reduction of planes flying overhead,			
4226	[e] purchasing of in-holding property around Lake			
4227	Ozette [f] more science and restoration management to			
4228	foster native wildlife and plants [including wolves			
4229	and other predators], [g] more work to remove			
4230	invasive, non-native plants and critters [such as mtn.			
4231	goats] and [h] repaired wilderness trails, signs,			
4232	cable-climbs, headland markers and such [trail to			
4233	Mosquito Creek is a disgrace; the Hoh Head cable climb			
4234	is falling apart - shame on you Mr. Superintendent!]			
4235				
4236	We want wild and scenic river designations placed to			
4237	the maximum possible. Also, we ask for any other			
4238	possible agency or policy wilderness designations or			
4239	protections to be enacted.			
4240				
4241	We strongly oppose any relaxation of rules for more			
4242	motor vehicles, more noise, more roads, more military			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4243	[Navy planes] circling overhead, more			
4244	snowmobiles/ATVs and other man-made insults to natural			
4245	ecosystems.			
4246				
4247	We ask that Olympic Park be preserved as primitive as			
4248	possible: un-bulldozed, un-motorized, un-noise			
4249	enveloped for future generations to visit and absorb			
4250	and restore themselves.			
4251				
4252	Outside the Park is all the noise, motor vehicles,			
4253	buildings, cell towers, roads, crazy drivers and			
4254	crowds - if that is what some people want. Keep all			
4255	that out of Olympic Park, please.			
4256	190708		Seki	WA
4257	I oppose any restrictions of motorboats on Lake Ozette.			
4258				
4259	It is my opinion there is room for motorboats, kyak, and canoeing on the lake. We have been using the lake for waterskiing and tubeing for years with our children and now our			
4260	childrens children.			
4261	For the most part, shareing the lake has never been a problem. People on a whole are curtious and respectful to one another as well as to the environment.			
4262	190948		Port Angeles	WA
4263	As a lifetime resident of the Olympic Peninsula, I am concerned about the content of your recently released draft general management plan for Olympic National Park. Our regions			
4264	economy depends on resource jobs in our forests and the seasonal tourist opportunities. The draft plan is full of incomplete, misleading or outdated data and it is very difficult to			
4265	follow your intentions.			
4266	Here are a few of my thoughts:			
4267	Do not expand the boundaries of ONP			
4268	Prioritize your maintenance needs and take care of your backlog			
4269	Develop new and innovative ways to provide programs to enhance the visitor experience			
4270	Develop a plan to increase visitation to Olympic National Park. This could be done in conjunction with local tourist organizations and Chambers.			
4271	Spend your budgeted funds wisely.			
4272	Your draft lacks a lot of supporting documentation.			
4273	There is a definite lack of local input based on your list of selected references.			
4274	Your draft plan does not acknowledge the contributions of the timber industry in their efforts to improve water and air quality, comply with the Endangered Species Act and the many			
4275	laws the industry helped create that protect habitat. You completely left the timber industry out of some economic references (pg 167) and made it sound as if the industry was a			
4276	distant memory. You did however spend considerable time citing logging damage on streams, sedimentation, erosion & viewscapes. It appears you were writing about past practices			
4277	and again not acknowledging the industries contributions.			
4278	Your best plan would be to adopt the no action alternative. Set priorities, get control of your budget and maintain and upgrade what you already have!			
4279	190607		None Provided	N/A
4280	I have read your "Summary & Guide to the Document" and found it heavy with "bureaucratese," (just what does "ethnographic" mean?) so I will just tell you what I would like to see			
4281	at the park.			
4282				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4280	My family are horsemen. I have been riding for over 40 years and belong to and am active in The Washington State Horsemen, Pacific Northwest Endurance Ride, Inc., The American Endurance Ride Conference, the Daffodil Arabian Horse Association, and The Arabian Horse Association. My family all live near Aberdeen so we are in close proximity to Olympic National Park. It would seem that the Park would be a wonderful place for horsemen to ride but it isn't. I don't know anyone who rides there. I was told by one of your people at the Amanda Park meeting on August 16, 2006 that most of the trails were originally stock trails. Why not now? When my daughter and I have tried to ride on the trails we find they are not safe for horses (too soft, too narrow) or they are closed due to fallen trees or wash-outs. The trailheads are usually not large enough to accommodate a truck and horse trailer.			
4281				
4282	A friend who lives at Lake Quinault has told me that as soon as a private residence comes up for sale, the Park pays top dollar for it. I find it hard to believe there is no money to keep the trails open and improve access.			
4283				
4284	We have a great big park right next to us. Please give us a place in it to ride.			
4285				
4286	188759		Albuquerque	NM
4287	I have enjoyed the Oympic hotspings several times and have paid the backcountry fees, and Olympic Park fees. If the hotspings are removed i will never visit Olympic Park again. Or even the State of Washington, which has very few hotspings anyway. I will spend my money in Oregon, where people know the meaning of "multiple use".			
4288	188739		Seattle	WA
4289	I'm impressed with the study, and the preferred alternative D seems reasonable. As a hiker, my interest is in keeping existing trails maintained. Thanks for letting us comment.			
4290	191013		Sequim	WA
4291	To Whom it May Concern:			
4292				
4293	I am a frequent visitor to the National Parks, especially Olympic. As well, I am a resident of Clallam County and an educator. It is crucial that the NPS understands the unique treasure we have in Olympic National Park, ecologically and purely in terms of beauty.			
4294				
4295	Please remember the following things when completing your General Management Plan:			
4296				
4297	Please establish river protection zones to ensure salmon habitats (as proposed in Alternative B.)			
4298				
4299	Please recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal			
4300	Wild and Scenic river designation.			
4301				
4302	Please limit development zones inside park			
4303	boundaries to current uses.			
4304	It is essential that new commercial developments,			
4305	campgrounds and RV parks, be located outside the park.			
4306	191017	City of Forks	Forks	WA
4307	On behalf of the City of Forks, the following comments are submitted with regard to the Olympic National Park's draft Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. The adoption of a general management plan (GMP) by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Olympic National Park (ONP) will be a milestone event having implications and impacts upon the Westend (Western Clallam and Jefferson County) for decades. The comments provided below regarding the draft GMP are divided into two categories: General/Overriding Comments; and, Specific/Technical Comments. Specific themes noted within the General Comments will be further explained in the Specific/Technical Comments as they relate to specific proposals within the GMP.			
4308				
4309	GENERAL COMMENTS			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4310	The National Park Service at Olympic National Park (ONP) has the responsibility of protecting unique resources and wildlife while ensuring a quality experience for all park visitors. Given this, we submit the following comments on the Park Service's draft general management plan for Olympic National Park. Specifically, we believe the NPS would be better served with a final GMP that emphasizes the development of appropriate visitor facilities; expanded ranger programs; realistic and limited boundary adjustments; and, strengthened Park Service/community relationships.			
4311				
4312	Visitors that come to the ONP expect useful, appropriate and safe facilities that are adequately staffed providing modern, up-to-date interpretive materials and services. Yet, many facilities in the ONP are in desperate need of renovation, expansion or modernization, despite the heroic and tireless efforts of ONP staff to keep such facilities useable and open. It is imperative that the final GMP place paramount emphasis and duty on improving visitor access and park visitor experiences. This can be accomplished by augmenting existing infrastructure, where practical, with facilities such as additional bike paths, new trails such as the Spruce Railroad Trail, expansion of the lodging seasons, the development of new campground sites, developing access for retirees and seniors, and modernizing existing facilities at such places as the Hoh River.			
4313				
4314	We also believe that we need to reverse the systematic decline of what is nearly an endangered entity within the ONP interpretive rangers and their associated program offerings. Visitors expect more from the NPS than large crowds of visitors trying to huddle around a ranger who is acting as an educator, interpretor, hike planner, camp ground fee collector, etc. Many middle-aged frequent NPS visitors will recall, and hope to partake, in such things as evening campfire talks and guided hikes. Yet, such programs are becoming increasingly rare, and as a result a truly profound and unique opportunity is lost by the NPS to develop with visitors a greater connection and appreciation for the ONP and the Service. In addition, the potential to attract visitors to the ONP's gateway communities in future trips may also be lost. There is no doubt that longer-stay and return visitors are good for local communities that cater to visitor needs. Therefore, the final GMP must emphasize the need to fully fund and expand the park's interpretive programs, while maintaining and improving its current information centers.			
4315	One of the "unique resources" of ONP is its rangers. We are adamant about the NPS having a duty to protect and increase the number interpretative and the backcountry rangers in the park. This should be a higher priority than large boundary adjustments and cooperative public/private conservancy efforts on lands adjacent to, but not owned by, the ONP.			
4316	We understand that there may be limited situations where there is a need to adjust the boundary of the park and land acquisition may take place. We will not support, and stridently oppose, any adjustments that would directly impact the economic viability of our community and the economic clusters of our region. Nor, can we support efforts by NPS to expand the boundaries of ONP areas when such a proposal would add additional regulatory burdens to private land owners. When land transactions occur, it must be with truly willing landowners who approach NPS. The transactions with such landowners should be the direct result of fair, good faith, and honest negotiations that do not arise from undue pressure or influence by NPS staff. Finally, boundary adjustments should not come at the expense of maintaining existing infrastructure and visitor access, or at the expense of modernizing and improving outdated and/or undersized existing visitor related facilities. Put bluntly, NPS should focus its fiscal efforts on improving what it currently has rather than chasing additional acres it lacks the resources to manage.			
4317				
4318	Further, the NPS data, and analysis of the same, associated with the economic benefit of boundary expansions does not appear to comport with the Information Quality Act (44 U.S.C. Sec. 3516) and the guidance associated with said Act as provided by the Office of Management and Budget. The economic analysis appears to lack significant quality in the information provided and relied upon. It also appears that the projected costs of the Land Acquisition/Boundary Adjustments lacks significant quality, reproducibility and reliability to be relied upon. Also, the analysis appears to lack objectivity with regard to the total economic impact of specific proposed boundary expansions at Lake Ozette. The City would specifically request correction of the presentation and substance of the economic analysis of the Ozette area boundary expansion.			
4319				
4320	The NPS must strengthen its working relationships with surrounding communities. In addition, we applaud the NPS for specifically noting that the Olympic park staff must be actively engaged in the communities in and around park borders. We encourage the Park Service to implement this as soon as possible. Focus should be placed on increasing the community's understanding of ONP and marketing the region to the visiting public. We also believe that the ONP staff must be actively engaged in various state-directed local planning initiatives associated with Watershed Resource Inventory Planning and salmonid recovery efforts. In these particular forums, the ONP has been absent even though it is one of the largest land owners with specific federal obligations associated with salmonid recovery.			
4321				
4322	We believe the implementation of these simple suggestions are in the best interests of the park, its stakeholders, gateway communities, resources and wildlife.			
4323				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4324	SPECIFIC/TECHNICAL COMMENTS:			
4325				
4326	Proposed Parkwide Policies and Desired Conditions			
4327	1. Air Quality, pg. 13. We applaud the NPS recognizing that it could be a partner in efforts to develop "clean fuels" and where applicable alternative transportation systems. Such proposed partnerships need to be publically vetted to ensure that there is (1) mutual benefit to those involved; and, (2) little to no impact to (a) the public's ability to access existing entry points; and, (b) the local communities in and about the park.			
4328				
4329	2. Ecosystem Management, pg. 16. Again, we applaud the final recognition of the ONP staff that they in fact have to "participate in collaborative planning efforts with adjacent land managers and tribal governments" when it comes to ecosystem management. However, the continual loss of ONP staff FTEs has resulted in the ONP missing opportunities to do what has been proposed specifically in regards to salmonid recovery planning efforts on the North Olympic Peninsula; and, also with regard to watershed based planning initiatives (WRIA planning) that have been underway for the past five years. In many ways, the ability of the NPS to share information in these initiatives has been severely limited by their lack of staff. This may also explain why specific documents were not reviewed or analyzed in the GMP, because NPS staff were in most cases unable to participate in the development of watershed resource inventory area plans, salmonid recovery strategies, etc.			
4330				
4331	Protection of viewsheds raises a concern in that ONP's holdings within specific watersheds and/or viewsheds may be only a small portion of the total landbase. However, if ONP is now wanting to utilize its presence as a way of extending land use controls outside of the boundaries of its ownership, such an approach must be limited to ensure that any such activities do not adversely undermine the existing economic clusters of the watershed/viewshed in question. Nor, exert undue influence over local jurisdictions having regulatory authority in those watersheds. Efforts to prevent such impacts to adjacent landowners must be incorporated into the plan.			
4332				
4333	3. Water Resources, pg. 18. As noted above, ONP may have missed an opportunity to discuss and collaborate on the development of instream flows, water quality and water related habitat issues by not being able to participate in WRIA 19 or WRIA 20 planning efforts. The lack of NPS participation was specifically noted and raised on certain occasions as discussions involved the various rivers, as well as Lake Ozette, that originate and/or flow through NPS territory. In addition, because of the nature in which waterways originate in NPS uplands, flow through private and state ownerships, and discharge in estuaries in and adjacent to NPS shorelines, the NPS needs to further explain what role it plans to play in water quality issues with regard to the strategy of attaining "the highest possible water quality standards available under the Clean Water Act."			
4334				
4335	4. Rivers and Floodplains, pg. 19. The strategy of identifying "park or visitor facilities located within" 100-year and 500-year floodplains is a prudent risk management objective. However, the strategy does not clearly identify what exactly NPS will do with such knowledge. In addition, later discussion of facilities at Mora, Hoh, and other such areas that would be retained unless "lost to a catastrophic event" appears to indicate a want by NPS to identify potential sites subject to such catastrophes, but do little to plan for replacement, movement, or improvement of such facilities to reduce such catastrophic losses.			
4336				
4337	5. Native Species, pg. 23. The strategy to promote harvest and management practices that protect wild salmonids is admirable. However, it appears to be an effort by the NPS to insert itself into a well defined, and litigated, system of salmonid management that involves the State of Washington and the recognized treaty tribes of the Olympic Peninsula working together as co-managers of said resource. While the NPS may have interests in these activities, those interests must be treated similar as any other interested party. In addition, NPS should be cognizant that its role in proscribing management practices is to be limited to those portions of streams and rivers within its existing boundaries. Advocating for regulatory changes outside of the park boundaries in the manner of harvest regulations, seasons, etc., in effect interferes with the rights of state and treaty tribe co-managers acting to protect each entities specific management rights.			
4338				
4339	6. Wilderness, pg. 26. The strategy to develop research activities associated with "wilderness ecosystem and key natural resources" is again admirable. However, the ONP existing budget appears to have little room for such activities and the associated needed facilities to undertake such research.			
4340				
4341	7. Archeological Resources, pg. 28. There appears to be no strategy as to how the ONP will approach archeological resources that may become threatened due to the environmental conditions of the Olympic Peninsula. Reference to such threats are noted within the "Desired Conditions Specific to Olympic National Park." However, there does not appear to be an accompanying strategy that outlines an approach to address such a threat.			
4342				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4343	8. Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes, pgs. 29-30. One continual concern that we have heard is that the NPS does not adequately protect the prairies, former homestead sites, and pioneer settlement areas within its landbase. These sites and landscapes may no longer have specific historic facilities, however, the earlier historic role they played are still visible via the plants and trees that remain from those pioneer settlements. Efforts should be made to further protect these sites, and provide historic interpretation information about these sites. Specific settlement activities within what is now the NPS do not appear to be referenced or addressed within the desired conditions and strategies: Lake Ozette, Queets Colony, Quinalt Homesteads, coastal homesteads, and Upper Hoh areas.			
4344				
4345	We are also specifically concerned about the approach to "Mission 66" structures and how this approach could significantly limit the NPS from making much needed improvements to such facilities as the Hoh Rainforest Visitor Center. We believe that the time has come to replace this outdated and undersized facility, and its original interpretative models. However, the strategy articulated in this section could add additional prohibitions to undertake any such improvements.			
4346				
4347	We also believe that there should be a strong articulation of the philosophy noted on GMP 79 that "benign neglect would not be considered an appropriate management strategy." This strong statement would be greatly appreciated by many of the descendants of individuals whose families settled areas now within the ONP's boundaries. In addition, local communities should be consulted prior to the removal of any historic structure through active NPS action or approved natural decay.			
4348				
4349	9. Museum Collections, pg. 32. We support the strategy associated with inventorying the ONP's collections. However, we would argue that this strategy is somewhat outdated in that it does not identify or discuss the possibility of sharing this inventory with a larger audience than those that come to the ONP HQ to access the inventory. We would advocate for the inclusion of a strategy that involves the sharing of the inventory, if not the actual item, via a digital facsimile. The Community Museum Project, of which ONP has played a significant and exemplary role, has demonstrated an ability to inventory, categorize and share with anyone having access to the internet never before seen materials in the ONP's possession. While this project is just now being unveiled to the general public, it is quite possible that the ONP contributions to it will be used by students, enthusiasts, researchers and visitors to better understand the Olympic Peninsula. In addition, the digitization of materials allows for access and use of the material with no further damage or impact to the original item.			
4350	Finally, if a catastrophic event were to take place that resulted in the damage or loss of the museum collections, the digital images could be utilized by future generations thereby "blunting the sting" of any such tragic loss. The ONP could partner with the University of Washington, Peninsula College, local school districts, tribal governments, and other entities to make this happen.			
4351	10. Visitor Use, pg. 33. One condition and/or strategy not fully discussed is how the GMP will ensure access to all generations of park users. The extension of wilderness and focus on additional wilderness experiences appears to be missing the growing demographic of "retiring baby boomers" touring the Nation's park at a time in their lives where endurance hiking and recreating may no longer be physically possible or their primary objective.			
4352				
4353	While discussed in greater detail below, the visitor's experience at the Hoh Rainforest is extremely limited by lack of modern facilities, outdated interpretive materials, and limited audio-visual presentation that introduces the visitor to the continental United States' only temperate rainforest. A desired condition should be modernized facilities that can in fact accommodate not only the number of visitors, but wide varieties of visitors and their various interests.			
4354				
4355	Outreach programs developed by ONP should actively, collaboratively and repeatedly involve local schools, tribes, and community organizations in their development, testing, and offering. Efforts should be made to work with local entities, as well as the State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to ensure such programs are scalable to various grades while fulfilling various state learning objectives and standards.			
4356				
4357	Web-based education needs to be a must and could be done in collaboration with state and local innovators such as the Washington Digital Commons, the Virtual Community Museum Project, as well as national institutions. Such web-based educational offerings need to be made free to the general public.			
4358				
4359	Lake Crescent Boundary Expansion GMP 34.			
4360				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4361	We do not see any analysis of the impacts associated with the loss of the existing lands in the Olympic adaptive management area of approximately 700 acres owned by the USFS. GMP 34. These lands are subject to limited silvaculture treatments pursuant to the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) and "will be used to develop and test management approaches which meet ecological, economic, and social objectives." We believe the GMP has not thoroughly analyzed the impact of the NWFP and its associated protections already in place in relationship to the lake habitat. Regarding the 80 acres of DNR owned trust lands, more information would be required to determine what deferrals are currently in place on those lands. As noted below, the proposed alternative and the analysis of the conversion of state, as well as the private, lands lacks any economic impact analysis to (1) local economies; (2) tax base; (3) regarding state trust lands, the beneficiaries of such lands; etc.			
4362	In addition, the presumption that harvesting of timber on state and private lands pursuant to the existing regulatory standards would result in adverse impacts to Cutthroat and Beardslee trout spawning habitat lacks any scientific reference or data. Also, the lack of analysis of economic impacts similar to those discussed below, albeit smaller in scale, needs to be addressed by the NPS in the final plan.			
4363	Lake Ozette Boundary Expansion GMP 35-36.			
4364				
4365	1. The GMP does not appear to clearly indicate the total amount of acreage by owner categories (e.g., state land, large private land owners, small private land owners) associated with each proposed boundary adjustment for each of the ONP regions. What summary of the acreage per area can only be found at pg. 372 of the document. It is odd that this information is not more clearly articulated earlier in the document. Nor, does it appear to indicate the extent in acres by owner categories for the proposed "cooperative private/public land conservancy strategies." This information, provided by park area and by each alternative would have been very helpful in undertaking further analysis of the proposals. The numbers provided only address property acquisition, and not the acreage envisioned by the NPS for "cooperative private/public land conservancy strategies."			
4366				
4367	2. The City renews its request that the Lake Ozette Boundary Expansion discussion be corrected to accurately, and without bias, present the total economic impact associated with the preferred alternative. The boundary expansion proposal includes the transfer of 60,000 acres of private, actively managed forest land that supplies timber to area mills. As explained later in the document, approximately 12,000 acres is associated with the Park boundary expansion, as well as 44,000 acres to be acquired and transferred to the State in exchange for the state deeding mineral rights to the NPS. The impact of this loss of timber supply source, is not even remotely discussed in the document. The proposed additional acreage would, according to some within the timber industry, be adequate to supply one lumber mill with enough product to maintain 100 employees. The removal of such a large volume of harvestable land would appear to have an economic impact that should be discussed as part of any alternative other than the "Alternative A Current Management" proposal. Pages 35-36, M21-24, 91, 230-232, 268-271, 306-308, and 346-348 have no reference to any possible impacts associated with the conversion of the existing timber lands			
4368	NPS Staff have attempted to explain that any detailed economic analysis of alternatives would be done after an alternative is chosen for adoption and a final EIS is issued. However, that would appear to be different than the usual NEPA process where efforts are made to analyze reasonably expected impacts from the proposed action of the federal agency. As currently written, the draft does not provide sufficient information to allow officials to make a reasonable choice between alternatives. Without such information, it would appear that that EIS and any decision thereon could be set aside by a court.			
4369	An additional topic that is not fully discussed in the GMP is the impact the expansion and DNR-NPS exchange would have upon the tax base relied upon by local governments. The concern is generated by the fact that the property in question is currently privately owned and paying private property taxes. By changing the ownership to federal and/or state owners there will be a direct economic impact upon the various local governmental districts that currently receive taxes from these land owners. In addition, none of those recipients of such revenues were contacted for specific information about such revenues in the development of this element of the plan. No reference to local government consultation can be found within the document regarding the preferred Lake Ozette alternative. See DEIS pgs. 354-356. When NPS staff was asked as to whether or not such entities were contacted, they informed City staff that they would be in the future. Nor, is it a valid assumption that federal "payment in lieu of taxes" would offset the loss in revenues associated with the change in ownership, use and tax status. Congress has not reauthorized that legislation and it is our understanding that a significant element in D.C. that remains uncertain as to the			
4370				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4371	In addition, there is no reference to the fact that even the proposed designation will result in increased regulatory compliance of private and state timber management in those areas designated for future NPS ownership. No discussion has been provided as to how the proposed designation could result in timber managers having to comply with "Class IV Special" forest practice requirements pursuant to Washington Administrative Code provisions found in WAC Chapter 222-15. Any such compliance requirements will reduce revenues to private shareholders as a result of the private companies having to expend funds to meet these additional administrative requirements.			
4372				
4373	In addition, the discussion of the local economy appears to be solely based upon a precursory utilization of the Census 2000 data. However, it does not appear that efforts were made to glean additional economic information and research from such sources as the State of Washington Department of Revenue, Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development, research entities at the University of Washington or Washington State University, nor the local economic development entities such as the federally supported Peninsula Development Authority, the various county economic development councils, and municipal economic development officials. Outreach to these entities could have resulted in a more thorough assessment of the economic situation on the Olympic Peninsula and could have provided background information needed to undertake an analysis of specific proposals upon local and regional economies. One document that might be of interest and relevance would be the Labor Market Analysis of Clallam County: A look at Wages and Employment between 1997 and 2004, Daniel A. Underwood and Dan Axelsen, 29 Jun 2005.			
4374	This report did extensive county specific economic analysis of the changes in the timber, tourism, and other economic clusters in Clallam County. Consultation with the Clallam County Economic Development Council might have brought such a document to the attention of the Denver-based authors of the GMP.			
4375	Further, the failure of the GMP to undertake a thorough analysis of such economic impacts may have resulted in the NPS dismissing the need to comply with Executive Order 12898 Environmental Justice. As we understand it, this executive order requires agencies to analyze their actions as to how they will affect communities that include minority and/or low-income populations. Western Clallam and Jefferson Counties fall within this description. However, the reliance by the NPS on multi-county statistics, and its failure to utilize readily available research at a more localized community level (See for example, Dr. Annabel Kirschner's Changing Conditions on the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas: 1990-2000 available on line at http://www.crs.wsu.edu/outreach/ark/onrc/index.html), appears to have resulted in NPS determining it did not need to comply with this Executive Order. The City of Forks' population in 2000 consisted of over 15% of the population being "Hispanic or Latino (of any race)", and 5% being "American Indian and Alaska Native". In addition, 14.6% of the families, and 20% of the individuals, living in Forks had incomes that were at or below the federal poverty levels. (Table DP-1 and DP-3, Geographic area: Forks City, Washington, U			
4376				
4377	Further, the draft GMP/EIS appears to emphasize possible improvements in the economic situation of the local communities by pointing to the various projects associated with implementing the GMP. However, in discussing those socio-economic impacts, there is no offset shown for the loss of jobs, direct or indirect, from timber management and harvest of those lands. As noted above, the proposed change in use of 60,000 acres of timber lands within Western Clallam County would have a significant impact on the available timber supply per year from private landowners. In a 1992 study of the impact of timber harvests to jobs undertaken by Richard Conway for the Washington Forest Protection Association and the WA Department of Natural Resources, it was demonstrated that approximately 8 direct jobs were created for every million board feet of timber harvested. If that harvest was sustainable, those said jobs would be sustained as well. If the 60,000 acres would produce a sustainable harvest level of 30mmbf, then there is arguably 240 direct jobs associated with that acreage in Clallam and Jefferson Counties.			
4378	It does not appear that any of the proposals, including the preferred, for the ONP's holdings in western Clallam and Jefferson counties would generate as many jobs as a result of implementing such proposals. Neither the GMP's selected references or preparers or consultants appears to include (1) third-party real estate appraisers, (2) economists versed in issues associated with the transference of land from managed timber to federal park designations; nor, (3) economists versed in the differences in direct and indirect job creation associated with specific land uses.			
4379	This request for correction is being sought pursuant to the Information Quality Act and the associated guidance provided to federal agencies by OMB due to the influential nature of the GMP.			
4380				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4381	3. The document fails to incorporate and review critical and historic documents associated with private and state timber land management that address concerns used to justify the land expansion. See pages 35-36, M21-24, 91, 230-232, 268-271, 306-308, and 346-348, 369-372. The specific documents that were not consulted or referenced with regard to their impact upon the lands proposed for NPS acquisition, or the concerns being addressed by NPS underlying the NPS proposal to acquire such lands include:			
4382				
4383	a. Washington State Department of Natural Resources Habitat Conservation Plan, Sept 1997. This document was approved by the federal services and addresses timber harvest activities, land management activities, conservation strategies for the Olympic Experimental State Forest which includes those DNR lands located in the Lake Ozette proposed expansion.			
4384				
4385	b. Washington State Forest and Fish Act adopted in 1999 by the State Legislature. This legislation requires timber land owners to take specific actions to address real and potential impacts to salmonid habitat across the State.			
4386				
4387	c. Washington State Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan, June 2006. A document signed by the Department of Interior and Commerce that provides an incidental take permit to the state for activities compliant with the State's forest practices act.			
4388				
4389	d. Washington State Department of Natural Resources polices and procedures associated with short and long term deferral of "mature (old-growth) forests".			
4390				
4391	In failing to consult these various forest practice related documents, the NPS may have obtained a false sense of urgency requiring the acquisition of additional property in order to protect species of concern. In fact, the above existing laws and agreements provide some of the highest level of protections ever in the State of Washington on private and state forest lands. By failing to consult these documents and analyze how they may increase protections on state and private managed timber lands, the NPS appears to have rushed to judgment on the best means of providing perceived protections at an expense that may not be warranted to justifiable. In addition, some of the NPS perceived and projected future harms associated with legal timber management practices on private and state lands, (found for example at 202-203, 237-240, 325 and 370), appear to lack scientific data associated with those perceptions and projected impacts; or, in the alternative may rely upon scientific data that did not arise out of studies conducted after the implementation of the State HCP and the Forest and Fish Act.			
4392				
4393	The City would specifically ask for correction of this portion of the document to:			
4394	· reflect or cite the scientific data relied upon for these assertions;			
4395	· indicate whether the relied upon scientific data reflects the current forestry regulations in the state that have received federal services support; and,			
4396	· correct the document as necessary as a result of additional analysis undertaken with a thorough understanding of these critical documents as they relate to legal and permitted private and state harvest management activities.			
4397				
4398	4. DNR NPS exchange. While the NPS is showing a level of innovation in proposing an exchange of lands between the NPS and the DNR as part of the Lake Ozette expansion, there are specific problems with the proposed exchange.			
4399				
4400	a. State forest lands (a.k.a. county trust lands or forest board transfer lands) would require specific state legislative action/authorization to permit any such exchange. See RCW 79.22.050, 79.22.060. Nor, would the proposed exchange comport with the one existing statutory exception to this prohibition on sale or transfer found at RCW 79.22.300. That exception allows state forest lands to be conveyed back to the benefiting county for county park usage with a right of reversion held by the state. RCW 79.22.300. There appears to be no reference to the need for state legislative action associated with any proposed exchange within the GMP. This oversight should be corrected.			
4401				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
4402	b. The proposed exchange, specifically the proposed Legacy Forest elements, does not appear to comport with the Federal and State Habitat Conservation Plan and specifically the Olympic Experimental State Forest components. As noted in the HCP, a document that was not referenced or consulted apparently by the NPS (see pages 37-39, 393-398), the Olympic Experimental State Forest is to be managed as an "unzoned forest" which is described as "a forest in which no special zones are set aside exclusively for either species conservation or commodity production." HCP IV.81. The proposed transfer of NPS acquired private timber lands in exchange for DNR lands and/or subsurface mineral rights owned by the State would appear to create a significant block with specific restrictions upon its management. Specifically, the GMP indicates that such a block would "involve an ecologically sustainable, best practices approach to forest management and could potentially be eligible for Forest Stewardship Council certification." GMP 35.				
4403	In asking NPS staff about this proposed exchange and whether or not it would be eligible for DNR regular management, the response seemed to indicate that this exchanged block would be subject to conditions and terms set by NPS. The amount of this proposed transfer being approximately 44,000 acres per the GMP at 379 would be approximately 15-20% of the entire OESF. Such a bargain may run afoul of the HCP by creating a significant land mass within the OESF subject to different management requirements than the HCP and in effect zoning 44,000 additional acres in the OESF.				
4404	The issue of presupposing a level of conservation stewardship certification is addressed below. However, the phrase "an ecologically sustainable, best practices approach to forest management" appears to presume that the DNR is not already doing this. As noted, the DNR is subject not only to the referenced HCP, but also the various forest practices act requirements, and internal practices that could be argued to be the most protective forest practices laws and regulations in the nation. This specific phrase appears to reinforce our position that the GMP authors failed to consult, review and consider the application of the State's Habitat Conservation Plan associated with DNR's landbase.				
4405					
4406	c. The GMP utilizes the term "Legacy Forest" and NPS staff (Richard Wagner) at the Forks Open House for the GMP noted that this was something proposed by Washington State Lands Commissioner Doug Sutherland. However, that is not an accurate reflection of what Commissioner Sutherland proposed and in fact, appears to either commandeer the Sutherland proposal, or confuse people regarding the intent of the NPS proffered block. The Sutherland "Legacy Trust" was one that would be actively managed per DNR's regulatory and trust mandates for the purpose of generating new revenues for recreation and conservation. The Sutherland trust was a unique attempt to create a source of "continuous funding to support recreation on DNR-managed lands and to support stewardship for DNR-managed natural areas." DNR FACT SHEET No. 02-143, 18 Sep 2002. The Sutherland proposal made it very clear that this trust would consist of lands comprised of "commercial forestlands" that would be part of the "working landscape" while generating revenues for a specific function "similar to how other state trust lands support specific beneficiaries such as schools." Id.				
4407					
4408	The discussion of the Legacy Forest in the GMP, as clarified by NPS staff, does not appear to comport with the Sutherland proposal.				
4409					
4410	d. Finally, and repeatedly, the proposed exchange lacks any economic analysis or discussion of beneficial or adverse impacts to the tax payers and/or trust beneficiaries. In addition there appears to be no discussion of the value of the subsurface rights to ensure that any decision maker could understand whether a fair bargain was being proffered by the NPS to the State.				
4411					
4412	5. The extension of the "wilderness designation" and boundary to encompass 2nd and 3rd growth forests appears to be an act of misleading the public into believing that such managed stands would become wilderness in the future without some intervention. No detailed discussion appears to explain how such private and state commercial forest lands would be converted into either "wilderness trail", "primitive wilderness" or "primeval wilderness" zones. Much of the DNR holdings near the SE corner of Lake Ozette appear to be under 40 years of age and would take decades, if not centuries to develop into such zones. Yet, the plan does not discuss or address such issues.				
4413					
4414	6. The proposal, as discussed and explained on pgs. 35-36, appears to extend the ONP jurisdiction and influence even beyond the proposed boundary expansion. Specifically, the proposal speaks of protecting "the remainder of the Ozette Lake watershed," as well as other watersheds within the ONP, through private/public land conservancy strategies. This element of the proposal has no economic analysis upon its impact on the lands outside of the proposed NPS expansion. The City does not support efforts by the NPS to extend its land use authority over property it does not own and in effect expanding the park in all but name and deed.				
4415					

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4416	7. Finally, the cost estimates for the land acquisitions are not realistic, reliable or even accurate reflections of the true costs. The City is expressly concerned about the alleged costs of the Lake Ozette acquisition, and the four proffered alternatives and specifically requests for a change of information based upon accurate, reliable, unbiased, and objective data pursuant to the Information Quality Act (44 U.S.C. Sec. 3516).			
4417				
4418	The City believes that the data associated with the alternatives as summarized in Table 2 is inaccurate. Recent transactions in western Clallam County have established a price for the purchase of commercial timber lands of at least \$2,500 per acre making the Lake Ozette expansion much higher than the total figure noted in the table for land acquisition for the preferred alternative. In addition, recent ESA Section 6 allocations from the USFWS associated with Western Rivers and the Hoh River Trust would indicate that conservation measures discussed through out the plan and the preferred alternative to protect viewsapes would cost approximately \$2,700+ per acre to acquire. For the most recent announcement, please see USFWS Press Release 06-109, SECRETARY KEMPTHORNE ANNOUNCES \$67 MILLION IN GRANTS TO SUPPORT LAND ACQUISITION AND CONSERVATION PLANNING FOR ENDANGERED SPECIES - Washington Grants Total More Than \$20 Million, 26 Sep 2006. Finally, the DNR's 2005 appraisal, and the summary of that document entitled 05-07 Trustland Transfer Land & Timber Values, for the Bite Hill Trust Land Transfer Project appears to affirm the City's position that the NPS project estimates are unrealistic.			
4419	DNR estimated the value of the 355 acres that make up the Bite Hill project as totaling \$2.23 million. These 355 acres are a small portion of the proposed Lake Ozette expansion proposed by NPS and are located to the immediate S/SW of southern most point of the lake.			
4420	From the materials, some of which was redacted, obtained by the City pursuant to a Public Disclosure Act request in July 2006, it appears that approximately 1/3rd of the Bite Hill parcel has recently (+/- <5 years) been harvested. An associated document, provided pursuant to the City's request of the DNR, notes that some harvest could be done within this stand pursuant to the HCP that could generate approximately \$30,000 per year from harvesting just ten trees per year. See memorandum entitled "South Lake Ozette" parcel management plan for the OESF Dickodochtedar Landscape. The information in this memorandum seems to imply that the July 2005 estimate for the Bite Hill acreage is probably at the lower end of the value scale. However, just using that 2005 estimate found within the 05-07 Trustland Transfer Land & Timber Values, a figure of \$6,281 per acre would be an appropriate estimate for the Ozette region.			
4421	Using these three different sources, it is very easy to realize that the Ozette expansion is more than what is reflected in Table 2 of the GMP. GMP 64. That table estimates the costs of the preferred alternative's land acquisition to be between \$18-24 million. However, the City suggests the following table may more accurately reflect just the cost of the 12,000 acres of the Lake Ozette boundary adjustment not inclusive of the 44,000 acres associated with the DNR-NPS exchange:			
4422				
4423				
4424	Basis for cost estimate No. of Acres Price per acre per basis for cost estimate Formula Total estimated cost for the Lake Ozette Boundary Adjustment/			
4425	expansion			
4426	NPS Lake Ozette Acquisition 12,000 acres* \$300-400 per acre** 12,000 x \$300			
4427	12,000 x \$400 \$3.6m -			
4428	\$4.8m			
4429	Recent Timber Acquisitions 12,000 acres \$2,500 per acre 12,000 x \$2,500 \$30m			
4430	ESA Section 6 Hoh River award 12,000 acres \$2,700 per acre 12,000 x \$2,700 \$32.4m			
4431	2005 DNR Bite Hill Estimate 12,000 acres \$6,281 per acre 12,000 x \$6,281 \$75.4m			
4432	* For this table, we are only looking at the 12,000 acres to be added to the Ozette boundaries as described at GMP 372. However, Table 2 of the GMP (GMP 64) is reflecting a total cost inclusive of all acquisitions described on GMP 372.			
4433	** This does not include the 44,000 acres associated with the DNR-NPS exchange, nor any estimates on costs for the public/private conservation initiatives on lands adjacent to the ONP's proposed holdings in the Ozette watershed. The amount of \$300-400 per acre used in this table is a result of taking the total of Alternative D for "Land Protection/Boundary Adjustments" (\$18-24m) and dividing that by the total additions found at page 372 including the 44,000 acres associated with the DNR-NPS exchange. Below is how that would be broken out in a somewhat similar table as above.			
4434	NPS Table 2 Total 59,940 acres \$300-400 per acre 59,940 x \$300			
4435	59,940 x \$400 \$18m			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4436	\$24m			
4437				
4438				
4439	The City would request, that pursuant to the Information Quality Act, this table's costs estimates for "Land Protection/Boundary Adjustments" be reevaluated for accuracy and objectivity, that the data be shared with the public that was used to determine the total amounts provided for each of the four alternatives, and if necessary, provide a peer review of such data to ensure its accuracy, reliability and objectivity.			
4440				
4441	Planning Issues GMP 41.			
4442				
4443	ONP should be applauded for recognizing that it needs to develop partnerships to "protect park resources and provide for visitor enjoyment." GMP 41. However, it is interesting that there is no specific item that ensures that the Park work better with local governments to create such partnerships. The issues associated with the "Tribal Relations" element could equally be raised and reviewed for gateway communities and county governments. We understand that the NPS has a specific, constitution and treaty-based trust obligation with the tribal nations of the Olympic Peninsula that is unique to those governments. However, we believe that the concepts noted in the "Tribal Relations" could be a frame work for the development of initiatives with local entities and the NPS.			
4444				
4445	Impact Topics			
4446				
4447	1. Without reasserting the concerns about the socio-economic analysis here for a second time, the City renews and reincorporates those concerns expressed above and reiterates the request for (1) changes to analysis and data, or lack there of, used in the GMP; and (2) further analysis of the economic impacts of the proposed boundary expansion on the economic base of Western Clallam County.			
4448				
4449	2. Without reiterating the position stated above, but reincorporating it here, the City believes that the NPS failed to comply with the wording and intent of Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice as it relates to minority and low-income populations of Western Clallam and Jefferson Counties. The boundary expansion could have a direct impact upon communities such as Neah Bay, Clallam Bay/Sekiu, Forks, La Push and Western Jefferson County. However, by amalgamating the four county's population and economic data, the NPS appears to have avoided compliance with the executive order and some of the guidelines quoted in the GMP. GMP 47. The City requests that the data analysis be undertaken to look at its impacts within areas or regions of the Olympic Peninsula to determine if in fact the NPS correctly determined that environmental justice was a topic that did not require further evaluation by the NPS. GMP 48.			
4450				
4451	3. We are uncertain that the assumption that the plan would not impact unique farmlands is correct, for both the Alternative B and Alternative D for the Lake Ozette Region may in fact impact lands that were once farmed and could be farmed again. Further analysis may be required to determine if in fact the GMP has "no impacts on primary or unique farmlands" in the Ozette basin. GMP 49.			
4452				
4453	4. The City is not supportive of "further studies of eligibility" for Wild and Scenic River designation for the Bogachiel, Calawah, Sol Duc and Hoh Rivers. There have been previous, and very contentious efforts associated with such efforts to designate these rivers as "wild and scenic" in their entirety, or portions thereof outside of the boundaries of the ONP.			
4454				
4455	The Alternatives			
4456	The following comments are focused on specific ONP regions and the preferred alternative (Alternative D) as presented within the GMP. The issues of boundary adjustments are not reiterated below, as they were dealt with in great detail already.			
4457				
4458	1. Elwha This area is outside of our City's usual "sphere of concern." However, one thing puzzled us regarding the CCC Campground site. M12 notes that the "former historic CCC campground at Olympic Hot Springs would be rehabilitated with some sites removed." We are concerned that the removal of camping sites within that historic property would reduce access to campers, while also altering a historic property that the GMP indicates the NPS is wanting to protect.			
4459				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
4460	4461	The establishment of the proposed development zone and day use in the Elwha area makes logical sense and provides a significant level of flexibility for the mark to (a) relocate facilities that may be lost in the natural processes that return to the river valley as a result of the Elwha Restoration Project; (b) allow for expansion of traditional camping opportunities; and, (c) allow for new infrastructure to be developed such as "pull-through" camping locations that could be utilized by the numerous recreational vehicles and travel trailers.			
4462	4463	2. Lake Crescent We support the designation of the environs along the North Shore Road and the Spruce Railroad Trail, and the East Beach Picnic area as day use. This recognizes what has in fact been the utilization of these areas for decades. It may also be logical to extend such day use designations, or seek the approval from Congress to do so, to Marymere Falls.			
4464	4465	We also support the efforts to develop along Lake Crescent greater access through the NPS' development of a universally accessible trail. However, any such trail must include an increased level of educational and interpretative information that currently exists about Lake Crescent.			
4466	4467	As noted above, there is little in the way of interpretive and educational information about the geology, ecology, cultural and historical importance of Lake Crescent readily available to the visiting public. The GMP should consider developing specific locations on the west and east entrances to Lake Crescent that allow for automobile pullouts that provide some of this information to the visitors. Existing locations may be available for such activities, but would require the development of interpretative materials. Another option would be to utilize low range radio repeating broadcasts that provide such information to the visiting public.			
4468	4469	3. Sol Duc We support the additional area designated as "development zone" to the N/NW of the Resort. Here again this allows for the flexibility to relocate existing facilities if lost, or develop other access options such as low-impact campgrounds, pull throughs, etc. It also might be logical to extend day use designations, or seek the approval from Congress to do so, to Sol Duc Falls.			
4470	4471	The pursuit of a seasonal transit system could provide another form of access to this region of the ONP, however, any parking facility would need to be secured in some fashion. In addition, the GMP does not appear to have designated any place within the region for parking and catching such transportation options.			
4472	4473	Further clarification should be provided as to what factors will determine whether facilities are relocated and/or expanded in this region of the Park, as well as its other regions.			
4474	4475	4. Ozette non-boundary adjustment issues, etc., already raised We support the designation of the northern portion of Swan Bay as "day use." However, we question why only minimum facilities would be provided at the associated boat launch that would be kept at this location. In addition to educational and interpretative information, visitor facilities such as privies, picnic tables, trash receptacles, etc., should be provided and maintained in this zone.			
4476	4477	We are not supportive of the idea of closing the Rayonier Landing. Information provided to us by former Rayonier employees lend credence to the Ozette community's position that this boat landing site was, is and should continue to be an access point to the Lake.			
4478	4479	We believe that boating of all types should be permitted on the Lake. An we stridently oppose efforts by NPS to reinterpret the intentions of Congress regarding all forms of boating as noted in the Congressional Record of 1976 (Senate 1 Oct 1976 Comments of Sen. Henry Jackson; and, House 29 Oct 1976 Comments of Rep. Don Bonker). Boating, as used by both of these political advocates for the Ozette designation included both non-motorized and motorized boating activities. Any effort to prohibit motorized boating on Lake Ozette would not be consistent with the intent of Congress, would limit access and recreational opportunities, and would extend the wilderness borders of Lake Ozette without Congressional Action to the surface of the Lake.			
4480	4481	We disagree with the proposal to redesignate and/or relocate camping opportunities now at the Ozette Campground to locations outside of the Ozette area of the ONP. Better utilization of the development zone at the western terminal of the paved road could result in additional, low impact camping sites. Under the proposed boundary adjustment there would be no other location near or overlooking the lake to camp that would be outside of the ONP.			
4482	4483	We are uncertain how a universally accessible front country trail could be developed without designating additional area as either "development zone" or "day use."			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4484	5. Mora We support the designation of most of the area associated with the NPS portion of the Mora Road/Rialto Beach Road as "day use."			
4485				
4486	We are concerned that the approach to Rialto Beach, following any catastrophic event, would be return to a "frontcountry accessible trail" rather than a universally accessible trail. As it currently is, Rialto Beach is one of the few places where individuals of nearly all ability can access the Pacific Ocean along the northern portion of the coast strip. In addition, all Rialto Beach facilities should be reestablished at a new trailhead if the existing facilities are lost in such an event.			
4487				
4488	We are also very supportive of the idea of a NPS-Quileute Tribe endeavor to provide boat or canoe service from Mora to La Push.			
4489				
4490	However, we are extremely disappointed that the ONP GMP does not discuss, nor provide possible solutions to, the decade running boundary dispute with the Quileute Tribe. While we are understanding of the continued efforts to resolve this issue, the GMP should indicate that some alteration, unknown or undesignated, could result into the boundaries of the ONP as a result of such a settlement. Failure to mention this issue, and articulate the NPS' intentions to resolve it, seems to undercut the goals articulated elsewhere within the GMP regarding a want by the NPS to improve its relationship with the Peninsula's tribal nations.			
4491				
4492	6. Hoh We support the designation changes found within the preferred alternative in and about the Visitor Center and Campground. Such designations more accurately reflect the type of activities currently taking place in and about that area. The City looks forward to working with ONP staff, local community members, and other interested parties in the creation of a development plan for that portion of the ONP. We believe that such a planning process needs to be made a high priority by ONP.			
4493				
4494	We are extremely supportive of the identification of the need to relocation the existing roadway away from the Hoh River's meander areas and would work with NPS to seek any required Congressional approvals to make that a reality. Such an effort should be part of a larger effort that also looks at relocating portions of Jefferson County's Upper Hoh Road. In addition, the City would hope that the NPS would work with the local community to seek appropriate federal designation and appropriations to address repairs, improvements, and relocation of the non-NPS portions of that road segment.			
4495				
4496	We are extremely pleased to see recognition of the need to improve the Hoh Visitor Center. This building, part of the historic Mission 66 initiative, is no longer meeting the needs of the visiting public to this portion of the ONP. The facility, maintained as a result of heroic staff efforts, is too small for the number of visitors that utilize it each year, lacks adequate interpretative and educational facilities, and has aging infrastructure no longer adequate to meet the demands associated with current use. We believe that a facility could be constructed utilizing modern, low/no-impact building methods that could provide better services to the visiting public and reduce maintenance costs. It is our position that this should be the number one replacement priority within the ONP system, and the City would be interested in working with ONP and NPS Regional staff to pursue such an improvement. Until that facility can be constructed, we believe that the ONP should make an conscious effort to modernize the interpretative information within the existing building to better reflect current knowledge and best available science on the ecosystems in this portion of the ONP.			
4497				
4498	The concept of a seasonal transit system originating outside of the ONP deserves a significant assessment. However, we would not be supportive of any such system that would not allow visitors to visit existing businesses along the Upper Hoh Road. Any system would need to be develop in close coordination with the residents and business owners of the Hoh Valley and other interested organizations. The City would be very interested in participating in such a study.			
4499				
4500	One thing that does not make sense, however, is the lack of any development zone designation in the area designated as the "potential location for relocation of existing facilities." We would be supportive of NPS efforts to seek congressional approval to modify wilderness designations for such a designation. At a minimum, some acknowledgement of day use in and about the trail head in that area should be reflected in the GMP.			
4501				
4502	7. Kalaloch We support the increase in the development zone in and about Kalaloch Creek. Such a designation will allow for a modification to existing facilities, or the relocation of some of those facilities. We believe efforts should be made by NPS to designate the western terminal of the Oil City Road, and the associated trailhead located there, as either low use or day use. If Congressional approval to do so would be required, we would be supportive of efforts by NPS to seek such approval. This area is currently being used in that capacity and the GMP should recognize this fact. We also believe that the roadway and area in and about the "Big Cedar Tree" should be designated day use.			
4503				
4504	We are intrigued in the idea of a relocation of SR 101 in this area. The City would be interested in participating in any study or discussions of such a relocation and the various proposed routes.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4505	We also are supportive of the proposal to create an appropriate visitors center in the Kalaloch area that would highlight the unique coastal elements of the ONP. In addition to cultural resources, such a facility could also highlight the historical maritime nature of the NW Pacific Coast. However, we believe that this should occur after addressing the critical needs at the Hoh Rainforest.			
4506				
4507	8. Queets We believe that there should be some recognition of the campground and boat ramp as "day use" within the GMP to reflect how in fact that area is utilized. As noted earlier, additional interpretative information about the historical efforts within the valley to develop it should be addressed.			
4508				
4509	9. Quinault We support the idea of expanding visitor services within the watershed and agree that such facilities could be located outside of the ONP boundaries in conjunction with other partners.			
4510				
4511				
4512	10. Wilderness. Except for the wilderness extension to the proposed Lake Ozette acquisition, the City is supportive of the preferred alternative that in effect keeps in place the current management approaches .			
4513				
4514	Other Comments			
4515				
4516	1. Table 5: Park Watersheds, GMP 103. We are confused as to why information was "not available" for this table regarding "percent of watershed in the Park." In addition to various local sources, such information could easily be obtained from a simple GIS inquiry.			
4517				
4518	2. Olympic Peninsula Tribes, GMP 135. The paragraph regarding the "usual and accustomed areas" of the Quileute and Hoh Tribes seems to simplify, and may as a result inaccurately reflect these areas. In addition, it is our understanding that the Quileute and the Hoh Tribes have specific management rights and responsibilities for the specific drainages listed in this paragraph. It may need to be rewritten to better reflect these things.			
4519				
4520	3. Visitation, crowding, survey results, GMP 139. It is of no surprise to us that these surveys referenced the Hoh Rain Forest as a crowded area considering its visitor center was designed and built for some 15,000 visitors and receives nearly 16 times that number each year. As noted earlier, replacement of that existing facility needs to be one of the highest new construction efforts of the ONP.			
4521				
4522	4. Information, Orientation, and Interpretation (IOI) general. One thing that we find peculiar is the lack of readily accessible interpretative information on the geology, ecology, cultural and historical aspects of the ONP at the various regions outside of the ONP HQ. While some kiosk do exist, as noted at GMP 146, there are not such kiosks at Lake Crescent's parking lot and restroom facilities, at either entrance to the Lake, Mora and Rialto Beach, etc. In addition, it does not appear that the cultural and historical aspects of the ONP are provided at various locations. ONP is a crown jewel for its ecological attributes, but the cultural and historical aspects should not be hidden from the visiting public, but rather added to the many other remarkable gems in that crown.			
4523				
4524	5. IOI Hoh. We will not disagree with the assessment of the Hoh Rain Forest Visitor Center found at GMP 147. We would only reiterate that because of these reasons a new visitor center is a must. We believe additional IOI resources need to be made available to the Hoh based upon the visitor center contacts noted within Table 7: annual recreation visits by district found at GMP 138. We feel that these numbers clearly argue for a higher priority for the replacing of the Hoh Rain Forest Visitor Center that can meet such a demand.			
4525				
4526	6. IOI Kalaloch. We concur with this assessment as well, and second to the Hoh Rain Forest Visitor Center, and believe it too needs to be replaced.			
4527				
4528	7. IOI/Education. ONP should take a more active and engaged effort with gateway community school districts, and webbased learning providers, to develop curriculum that could aid student learning. Such activities would not only increase awareness of the ONP, but in all likelihood help develop the next generation of ONP visitors and users.			
4529				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4530	8. SocioEconomic Environment, GMP 163-173. As discussed elsewhere, the City believes that this element is precursory and does not accurately reflect some of the economic issues associated with the various subregions and gateway communities neighboring the ONP. This element needs to be thoroughly reworked to the point that every neighboring tribal nation, as well as each gateway community, is covered in as much detail as the Jamestown S'Klallam Reservation. While county-wide information may be accurate, it may hide disparities within each county between subregions. Such information is available and was publicly shared throughout the region a few years ago as a result of efforts by various local governments to look at the changes between census years. As noted above, the NPS should have availed itself of the local knowledge and research information undertaken as part of the various economic development initiatives within the region. However, for some unknown reason, only one specific jurisdiction was chosen for such an undertaking.			
4531				
4532	9. Forest Information Station in Forks, GMP 333. We are uncertain what is meant by "minimal interpretation and opportunities for visitors to learn about park and forest resources, and help with safe trip-planning." We are certain that this poorly worded reference to the Forks facility is not implying that the NPS staff that provide that information on a daily basis are providing "minimal" information. We strongly believe that this is one of the few places outside of the ONP HQ where a wide variety of services and information can be obtained with relative ease from some of the best informed, highly motivated, and easy to approach NPS staff in the ONP.			
4533				
4534	10. Impacts on the Socioeconomic Environment, GMP 346-348. Most of the significant, substantive concerns about this section were addressed elsewhere. However, there is no clear discussion of the loss of ONP staff over the past 30 years by area of function and duty. We believe that the general public probably should know where those losses have occurred, why they have occurred, and what impacts those losses have had on the local economy.			
4535				
4536	11. The GMP should include the latest "facility condition index" ratings for the ONP's various facilities. In addition, a discussion of the maintenance backlog for the ONP should be a significantly important appendix discussion to the GMP. Such an appendix would allow future generations to determine whether or not the adopted GMP in effect addressed these specific facility and maintenance related issues.			
4537				
4538	We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments to the NPS on the Olympic National Park's draft General Management Plan. We look forward to working with the ONP as it develops a new chapter in its history on the Olympic Peninsula. We are hopeful that the ONP will continue to develop and engage its local communities in its development, management and operations.			
4539				
4540	Most respectfully submitted on behalf of the City of Forks,			
4541	190922	Environmental Protection Agency	Seattle	WA
4542	Letter on File			
4543	191198	Jefferson County Department of Public	Port Townsend	WA
4544	Letter on File	American Rivers	Seattle	WA
4545	190827			
4546	Letter on File			
4547	190999		Forks	WA
4548	This letter is in response to provide information in regard to the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the Olympic National Park			
4549	First, I wish to thank the staff for the effort to bring this subject before the local community.			
4550				
4551	Next, the immediate problems and current issues are highlighted; Followed by outline of results desired by the local community; Concluding with a critique of the current Plan/EIS document.			
4552				
4553	The principle problem facing the Olympic National Park is that of insufficient funding being appropriated for maintenance of existing facilities and the addition of new construction. Sewage systems are inadequate in many places and cannot handle the current demand of increased visitor use, contaminating major rivers.			
4554				
4555	Roads are failing, limiting dispersal of traffic loads, and enjoyment by disabled people. Adding more acreage to the park does not solve these problems, it exacerbates them. Past improvement planning has not accomplished better facilities to the then anticipated levels, even now. Visitor contacts have evolved to weapons-carrying law enforcement rangers. Not a comforting image to visitors expecting interpretive services.			
4556				

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
4557		The included maps fail to depict the thousands of acres of private property including working ranches, many dozens of active homesites and other holdings adjacent to the Park.			
4558					
4559		The concept of purchasing timber lands and agricultural or residential lands from small landowners adjacent to the Park boundaries for trade to the State, is an affront to the residents and owners. These lands, when traded to the State of Washington would be classified as "Legacy Forests" or have similar distinction. It would preclude these lands from being harvested, or any other purpose, create a de facto wilderness buffer and seriously harm the economy of the people and the county. Any elk now enjoying the private lands as a refuge would be slaughtered by tribal or other hunters, just as they are in the Park. Only posted private property provides protection against wanton wastage of meat so often seen.			
4560					
4561		There are several thousand acres of timber land which could be designated for State Legacy Forest, without harming the small landowners and agricultural producers. This is the acreage now held by the Hoh River Trust. Grants were awarded by the State of Washington, with public money, to purchase this land from Rayonier Timber Company between 2000 and 2005. While some private funds may have been contributed, the Park Service could investigate purchase of only sufficient acreage to satisfy the offset (trading) for mineral claims by the State and the State could allow designation as Legacy Forest on these areas, without impacting the local communities.			
4562					
4563		Reviewing the Draft Plan has provided an invaluable insight into the level of cognizance and understanding by the authoring participants, of local culture, education, agricultural and forest economy and appreciation for individual responsibility to maintain viability of the area and its people. It is a two-way, effective, communication and learning process, requiring continuation.			
4564					
4565		Any opportunity for governing bodies' representatives to present factual information is always welcome in the community. A responsible dialog brings technical data to the community and the voice of local observation and experience serves to bring balance to concepts and theory.			
4566					
4567		We will always invite you to share information and ideas in return for the opportunity to look, listen and learn as to what works, or doesn't in the real-world setting. There are few concrete sidewalks, or streetlamps here.			
4568					
4569		Other civilizations depended on the experience and teachings of the elders for skills and knowledge to continue to exist. In the Hoh River valley, there are millenniums of such experience and teaching. Then, as now, the continued presence of those who have observed and understand and teach is paramount.			
4570					
4571		This premise is expanded on, that:			
4572					
4573		Each farm provides agricultural products for the expanding population of large urban areas and is a source of heritage seeds for a secure food supply;			
4574		Each farm meadow and clearing support deer and elk, as well as livestock, for most of the year;			
4575					
4576		Each clear-cut has produced many varieties of wood fiber products and will regenerate, after successive harvests, several times in one's own lifetime;			
4577					
4578		Each community offers conveniences and facilities for visitors;			
4579					
4580		Every river basin is different, some need the continued intervention of man to restore the system to productive fisheries, if, in fact that is the true ultimate goal. Recognize that onerous increases to buffers will only provide disincentives to affected landowners and will not result in long-term solutions.			
4581					
4582		Existing problems along streams can be corrected by providing funding sources to area residents, utilizing local contract labor and equipment. We do not want to see funding as the holographic image in a mirrored bowl on the coffee table, appearing to be filled with cash, yet untouchable. A reliable source of funds must be available to carry out projects necessary to simultaneously enhance habitat and protect property.			
4583					
4584		There is no evidence that farms, homes and businesses in the Hoh Valley are harmful to the reproduction of salmonids and other species. Many roadside fires have been put out by local residents, which were caused by careless visiting smokers or campers, that could easily have destroyed vast areas of the Park if not immediately found.			
4585					

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
4586	4587	Virtually no credit and only brief mention is made of the early pioneers and their history in the area. Little recognition is given to the smaller communities for their amenities and contributions of knowledge to people whom wish to enjoy the Park. Brochures for these establishments are hidden from view at visitors' centers and only revealed upon insistent query. Only the Concessionaires' pamphlets are openly displayed. This has been a complaint frequently voiced to proprietors of local facilities.			
4588	4589	When combining Park management issues and their effect on local population, industry and business with several other sources of scrutiny, a different motive is beginning to evolve: Factions which believe that the only answer is total Park control of the Olympic Peninsula do not consider the detrimental aspects of occupation by homeless persons and the devastation on plant communities and wildlife. The addition of "Princess Cruise" lodges along a controlled-access highway will not alleviate such a problem. Exclusive corporate management will not enhance enjoyment of the Park, it will cater only to the elite.			
4590	4591	In an early effort to expand the park, statements made by Department personnel in a private meeting, some 63 years ago, to the effect that: "If you are not a willing seller, you'll wish you had been." (Fred and Lena Fletcher, landowners, ca. 1943) has created serious doubt among many contemporary people that the Park would be capable of defending the interest of the small private landowners as set forth in the Act of Dec. 22, 1938, U.S.C. sec. 255., Sec. 5. Only Congressional intervention prevented personal loss of land.			
4592	4593	Until the Olympic National Park can correct the shortcomings of its visitor services and thus reestablish its credibility with visitors from all regions of the world, it would be a mistake to distract from the real issues of stewardship by diverting attention to narrow perceptions for land expansion. Therefore, Option "A" of the Draft General Management Plan should be the guiding principle to select for the next two decades. Funding for visitor interpretive services, historical structures and facility maintenance and repair of roads should be authorized by Congress and would be fully supported by the local community, as well as nationally. Option "D" is entirely unacceptable, not only with the more than three dozen families whom would be displaced, but the maps for the plan are faulty in failing to recognize that it is not just State land, as explicitly depicted, thereon.			
4594	4595	It would be unfortunate if, after so many years of effort and expense, the outcome of this Plan results in the "one size fits all" regulations or "super-pristine reserve" designations being enacted for Park management, foreclosing opportunities with absolute policies not based on science. Then the Plan is nothing more than a chimera and redemption for the department would be difficult to regain. The credibility of the many participants contributing to the plan would then be a setback of further support.			
4596	4597	Congress should act, without hesitation, to decommission Wilderness designation on lands adjacent to Indian Reservations to provide for moving schools, residences, businesses and other aspects of communities now subject to Tsunami inundation, to safer ground. Congress should act to provide the same relief for federal lands when required to relocate roads, campgrounds, structures and administrative sites.			
4598	4599	ALTERNATIVE "A", PREFERRED BY THE HOH VALLEY COMMUNITY			
4600	4601	All other Alternatives, (B, C, D) are constrained by Wilderness designation, an issue which must be resolved before Congress before any changes could be made effecting development in such areas.			
4602	4603	With the needs of the hurricane Katrina victims as yet unmet, the ongoing Mideast conflicts, the closure of neighborhood schools and the unmet medical needs of our youth and elders, it is questionable to appropriate, or obtain by any means, any additional funds to acquire further private property for any Park purpose.			
4604	4605	It is an opportune time to Partner with businesses in local communities to provide for the comfort needs of the visitors, leave the burden of accommodations at points outside the boundary and provide safe parking, trails, campsites, picnic tables, toilets and interpretive services, within.			
4606	4607	Alternative "A" does not bind the Department to "No Action". Progress need not stagnate under this Alternative. Each frontcountry portal has its own unique characteristics, opportunities and limitations. Universally accessible trails can be developed, along with dispersed visitor opportunities. "Diverse groups" can be isolated from the public by posting times for "Interpretive walks", group camp facilities could include walled and roofed shelters, heated restrooms and surfaced access roads/trails.			
4608		Project support can be enhanced by local community participation in planning, assessment and implementation phases.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4609				
4610	There are numerous improvements which can and need to be done under Alternative "A", and it should not be looked upon as a constraint.			
4611				
4612				
4613	CRITIQUE OF THE CURRENT PLAN DOCUMENT			
4614				
4615	At some point, along a major river, a highway, there will be an interface with infrastructure. Selection of the best point of intersection depends on many facets, both physical and political. Not anywhere in the Plan is identification made of existing prime agricultural land in use adjacent the exterior boundary. Private land holdings are neither shown on the maps nor recognized in the text. An analysis of agricultural contribution to the local, county and state economy has not been made.			
4616				
4617	Page 47- Environmental Justice: This document dismisses, out of hand, the fact that communities and populations in the western portion of Clallam and Jefferson counties, do in fact suffer from low-income and are below the poverty level in many cases. When the private land is taken from them the result is severe impact to their health and well-being. However, since the plan fails to admit that, here, is a population dependent on land ownership, the document is deliberately misleading.			
4618				
4619	Page 50-Water Quality: The summer turbidity of the mainstem of the Hoh River is due to glacial melt releasing suspended particulate material and not only from channel changes and bank undercutting.			
4620				
4621	Page 101- The map is untitled, to what purpose?			
4622				
4623	Page 103- Hubert Glacier drains into the South Fork of the Hoh, yet this stream is classified as non-glacier.			
4624	CONCLUSION			
4625				
4626	Much work needs to be done for another draft of the Plan.			
4627	The major shortcomings are:			
4628	1.) Lack of recognition or discussion of the economy, lifestyles and well-being of the residents and businesses of the surrounding neighbors.			
4629				
4630	2.) Understanding how the surrounding farms are caring for the land.			
4631				
4632	3.) Recognizing how timberland owners contribute to habitat and water quality under current state and local laws.			
4633				
4634	Many more issues need to be aired, discussed and evaluated. There is little community confidence that the plan has considered the People.			
4635	In response to any queries of personal qualifications to propose and discuss the foregoing issues, I submit:			
4636	The influence of the river has been important to the livelihood of the family, from the cedar dugout canoe, in which I was a passenger, used to ferry supplies and people some 25 miles upriver from the ocean, to the floating of Sitka spruce cants for aircraft construction ca. WW1. A bridge was constructed in 1943 for removal of timber for that world war, by construction of an access road across the river, canoe used no more.			
4637				
4638	I am a grandson of one of the first homesteading pioneers in the Hoh River Valley.			
4639	Five generations of ancestors occupy the family cemetery on the homestead, now a cultural resource and sacred ground in its own right.			
4640				
4641	I have made it a point to observe the action of the river for more than 60 years and understand the forces and influences involved. I am a Registered Civil Engineer, Land Surveyor and Water Right Examiner. I have designed roads and projects to protect structures from the action of rivers. Many have involved federal land issues, location of Wilderness boundaries, wildlife and resource protection and well understand the people and issues concerned.			
4642				
4643	I appreciate this opportunity to address this Plan development and would welcome further questions, either by e-mail or in person. This does not constitute my final comment and I reserve the right to make further submittals.			
4644				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4645	Thank you, for the opportunity to respond.			
4646	190702		Amanda Park	WA
4647	Please make some attempt to keep as much land in low use zone as opposed to day use only. Especially in and along the river valleys such as the Quinault River between the lake and the bridge.			
4648				
4649	These areas are the lowest fire danger and the least apt to suffer from damage from useage. Often they are sand and gravel bars exposed after annual flooding.			
4650				
4651	Low use zones are the best possibility for families with small children to camp away from campgrounds and teach the ethics and proper habits for low impact camping.			
4652	190532		Forestville	CA
4653	I request that the NPS adopt the following policies regarding the hot springs access:			
4654				
4655	A. Retain soaking at Olympic Hot Springs, but reduce the number			
4656	of pools at the Springs site to three or four, located near the main			
4657	source. This will improve cleanliness by offering less restriction to			
4658	flow. It will help rehabilitate the runoff area, reduce the impact of			
4659	use and enhance the integrity of the environment.			
4660	B. Contract the maintenance of the resource to an experienced			
4661	caretaker. This approach has been implemented with great success by			
4662	other agencies responsible for managing hot spring resources in the			
4663	Pacific Northwest.			
4664	C. Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail beyond			
4665	the Altair site. This is similar to an item proposed in Alternative B			
4666	of the draft of the General Management Plan.			
4667	191212		Bow	WA
4668	It has recently come to my attention that the National Park Service is considering implementing some very serious changes in the Lake Ozette area. I oppose the Drat General Management Plan, alternatives B, C, & D. My support is with alternative A,the no change option.			
4669				
4670	I have been enjoying the Lake Ozette area for 25 years. If Ozette became a Wilderness area it woudl change the nature of the area considerable. It woudl restrict the public's use of the area by eliminating trails, boat launches, and campsites. If less people came to enjoy Ozette, this would negatively impact the local businesses who are already struggling to survive in a low population area.			
4671				
4672	The "boundary adjustment" of 12,000 acres woudl not benefit the homeowners in the area in the least. My understanding is that most of the home and land owners in the area are not interested in selling. As far as protecting Lake Ozette from logging of the area around Lake Ozette, it has for the most part already been logged.			
4673				
4674	In a time of budget cuts and restricted funding, I question whether the Park Service will be able to monitor and maintain greater acreage. It does not seem like the time to expand borders. It doesn't make sense.			
4675				
4676	I will also be writing my elected officials and hopefully they will have an influence on the management plan.			
4677				
4678	Please keep the environment as it is at Ozette and do not implement alternatives B, C, or D. Thank you.			
4679	190640		Boise	ID
4680	I support Alternative A. I own property (real estate including cabin) on Lake Ozette near Swan Bay, and the property is only accessible by boat. The proposed restrictions on use of the boat launch area at Swan Bay, as outlined in Alternatives B, C, D, will severely hinder my ability to use and maintain the property. I am also concerned about implied restrictions on the use of motor boats in Alternatives B, C, D. Alternatives B, C, and D would be acceptable to me only if they address these issues and concerns associated with private property around Lake Ozette. For example, if private property owners were issued gate keys for 24-hour access to Swan Bay, that would be acceptable. In summary, I support Alternative A.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4681	191194		Seattle	WA
4682	As a descendent of some of the Pacific Northwest's earliest white settlers, I believe preserving Olympic National Park's natural system and restoring threatened wildlife and wilderness is of utmost importance.			
4683				
4684	I affirm proposals for intertidal reserves along the Olympic Coast and wilderness study of Lake Ozette. I oppose expanded campgrounds, increased development, and protecting roads before salmon. Measures are needed to fully protect Lake Ozette and Crescent Lake watersheds, and the Queets, Quinault, and Hoh River systems through land acquisition but not trade. I urge you to emphasize recovery for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species and their habitats, including critical salmon habitats, and recommend all 13 eligible rivers for wild and scenic river designation. These are national inherited treasures to preserve for those who come after us.			
4685				
4686	Thank you for your time and consideration.			
4687	190790		Phoenix	OR
4688	Please consider our comments which follow on the Olympic National Park draft General Management Plan. I, Liz Robinson, visited Olympic National Park on a family trip in about 1958, and I can still remember the spectacular mountains we saw from Deer Park and Hurricane Ridge, and the majestic rain forest we saw on the Hoh River. Olympic is a wonderful part of our Northwest heritage, and we appreciate the efforts of the National Park Service to keep it wild.			
4689				
4690	Our concern is that the "preferred" Alternative D is not strong enough to protect the critical habitats and natural stream ecology of Olympic National Park. It contains some good features, but it allows too much development and it fails to adopt measures that are needed to protect fish and wildlife habitat. We urge Boundary additions described in Alternative B for the entire watershed of Ozette Lake, the trout spawning watersheds near Crescent Lake, and elk habitat along the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault Rivers, totaling 87,000 acres. Please include those in your final plan instead of the inadequate areas proposed in Alternative D.			
4691				
4692				
4693	Please adopt the river protection zones proposed in Alternative B and complete Wild and Scenic River Act studies for all 13 eligible rivers.			
4694				
4695	The enlarged development zones in Alternative D would do great harm to the Elwha and Sol Duc valleys, allowing more buildings for commercial operations and tripling the size of campgrounds in areas that are now a fine area for fishing, picnicking, and easy hiking. Why not encourage more tourist accomodations outside the park? Local businesses could do the job, as they do here in our area near Crater Lake National Park.			
4696				
4697	We are all in favor of the "intertidal reserves" on the Olympic coast line, studies of optional public transit for the Hoh, Sol Duc, and Hurricane Ridge, and wilderness studies of Ozette Lake and the Crescent Lake northern slopes.			
4698	190938	Rochelle Environmental Forestry Consulting	Olympia	WA
4699	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Olympic National Park. My comments focus on Alternative D, Olympic National Park's (ONP) preferred alternative, specifically with regard to its proposed actions for expansion of the Ozette and Lake Crescent portions of the Park. These comments were prepared at the request of Green Crow Timber, LLC of Port Angeles, WA, which owns approximately 1,500 acres of forestland in the area of proposed park expansion at Ozette and another 500 acres within the proposed Lake Crescent expansion area. . Also, in the Ozette watershed, Green Crow owns approximately 5,000 acres and manages, for institutional investors, an additional 11,000 acres within the 44,000 acres proposed for purchase and exchange with the State of Washington School Trusts administered by the WA Department of Natural Resources.			
4700				
4701	The major concern of these private forest land owners and investors is the expansion of the park to include private managed forest lands, ostensibly for the protection of the threatened Lake Ozette Sockeye salmon and its critical habitat, the watershed and water quality of the lake, and the view shed. Also, in the Lake Crescent area, the GMP suggests the proposed expansion near the lake outlet at the head of the Lyre River is necessary to protect the spawning areas for Beardslee and Crecenti trout.			
4702				
4703	Concerns expressed here regarding alternative D apply to alternatives B and C as well, as they propose expansions encompassing even greater acreages of private forestland.			
4704				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4705	Under Alternative D, park boundary adjustments in the Ozette unit include expansion to include 12,000 acres of private forest land within the park boundary and the acquisition of an additional 44,000 acres of private forest land outside the park boundary but within the Ozette watershed to exchange for the mineral rights owned by the Washington Department of Natural Resources within the boundaries of ONP. The proposed boundary expansion at Lake Crescent will include an additional 1640 acres of private forestland.			
4706				
4707	ONP's proposal states that private forest lands within the expanded boundaries would be managed under cooperative private/public land conservancy strategies to protect fisheries habitat, water quality and the view sheds and that private land acquired for exchange with DNR would be purchased from willing sellers.			
4708				
4709	Arguments against park expansion to encompass additional area in the Ozette watershed.			
4710				
4711	In my view, park expansion for the protection of the threatened Lake Ozette Sockeye salmon and its critical habitat, the watershed and water quality of the lake, and the view shed is not warranted, and in fact will be less effective in achieving these objectives than several programs currently in place. The expansion proposal fails to acknowledge the existence of these initiatives, which include the Washington Forest and Fish Regulations (FFR) which are supported by a Federally-approved Habitat Conservation Plan, and the Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon Recovery Planning process (LOSREP) being administered by NOAA Fisheries. These initiatives, discussed further below, currently provide both aquatic resource protection (FFR) and will identify and implement restoration and enhancement activities targeted at the factors considered to be limiting Sockeye salmon populations (LOSREP). Both of these initiatives include active processes, in comparison to ONP's proposals which are passive, and as a result will lead to more rapid, focused improvements in habitat conditions for fish and wildlife.			
4712				
4713	Since these initiatives have not been considered, or even acknowledged in the GMP, the requirement, under park policy, that an expansion of park boundaries requires a determination that other alternatives for management and resource protection have been considered and are not adequate (Appendix B, p.369 ONP-GMP), has not been met.			
4714				
4715	The Forest and Fish Regulations			
4716				
4717	This set of regulations, focused largely on environmental protection, was developed cooperatively by state and federal agencies, industrial and small-private landowners, and tribes, and sets the rules for conduct of forest practices on state and private forest lands in Washington State. The objectives of the FFR, as defined by the WA State Forest Practice Board, which is made up of a range of stakeholders with key interests in resource management on state and private forestlands, are to:			
4718				
4719	§ Provide compliance with the Endangered Species act for aquatic and riparian-dependent species.			
4720	§ Restore and maintain riparian habitat to support a harvestable supply of fish			
4721	§ Meet the requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act for water quality.			
4722	§ Keep the timber industry economically viable in the state of Washington			
4723				
4724	Key elements of FFR, which ensure that forest management activities protect aquatic resources, and lead to improved aquatic habitat conditions, include:			
4725				
4726	§ Expanded stream protection rules			
4727	§ Protection of unstable slopes			
4728	§ Road maintenance and abandonment planning focused on achieving fish passage and water quality improvements.			
4729	§ An adaptive management element which will direct changes to the regulations if research and monitoring indicates that the new standards are not being achieved.			
4730				
4731	Additionally FFR addresses view-shed concerns through its limitations on harvest unit size and requirements for green-up prior to harvest of adjacent units. FFR also contains provisions for voluntary modification of management practices in areas of high public exposure and aesthetic sensitivity.			
4732				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4733	The regulations are supported by the State of Washington's Habitat Conservation Plan (National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2006), which covers 70 species of native fish and amphibians, and applies to 9.3 million acres of state and private forestland and more than 60,000 miles of streams. The HCP states that Washington State Forest Practice Rules are strong enough to protect fish habitat and water quality in accordance with strict Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements.			
4734				
4735	Lake Ozette Sockeye Salmon Recovery plan			
4736				
4737	This plan, scheduled for completion in December 2006, is based on a Limiting Factor Analysis (LFA) that identifies and prioritizes factors limiting population recovery (Haggerty 2006). The LFA has hypothesized, but not quantitatively demonstrated, cause and effect relationships between forest management activities and sockeye population declines. In fact, Sockeye and other salmonid populations crashed before substantial timber harvest occurred in the Lake Ozette watershed (Dlugokenski et al. 1981, Jacobs et al. 1996). These hypothesized relationships of forest management to Sockeye declines and lack of population recovery are largely based on past logging and road construction practices which preceded the adoption and continual strengthening of forest practice rules over the past several decades, the latest being the Forest and Fish Regulations and HCP discussed above. Nevertheless, the recovery plan currently under development will address those hypotheses by identifying actions to address concerns regarding detrimental effects of logging and road construction on sockeye habitat and implement restoration or enhancement projects where a specific need is identified.			
4738				
4739	The LFA identified a number of additional factors as limiting Sockeye recovery in Lake Ozette. Among these are predation on adult and juvenile fish both within the lake and in the Ozette River, lake level changes caused by early settler clearing LWD for navigation on the Qzette River, poor spawning habitat conditions within the lake caused by the lake level changes, and low populations levels resulting from historic over fishing. The likelihood that these factors are of greater importance than forest management in limiting sockeye recovery is supported by observations of the status of fish populations in adjacent watersheds with similar physiographic conditions and logging and road construction histories. An example is the Lake Pleasant Sockeye Population, for which threatened species listing was not considered to be warranted at the time Ozette sockeye were listed. This beach-spawning population is considered to be relatively healthy and stable, or possibly increasing (Personal communication; Chris Northcutt, Quileute Tribe, July 2006). Coho salmon production in streams in the watershed of Lake Pleasant is also high and increasing.			
4740	Over 85% of the watershed is in state and private ownership and has many similarities to Ozette with regard to geology and logging history. (WA DNR, Sol duc Watershed Assessment 1994)			
4741	Similarly, the Dickey watershed, a Quillayute river tributary largely in private ownership and managed for forest products, has supported healthy Coho salmon populations on a continuing basis (WA DNR watershed assessment 1998). Significant spawning densities of Coho salmon occur in almost all tributaries of the Dickey, which has similar soils and geology and a logging history comparable to that of the Ozette Basin. This river system was rated healthy by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and considered one of the most productive for Coho salmon in the state (WDFW 1992).			
4742				
4743	The relatively good condition of the Lake Pleasant sockeye and Dickey River populations, in spite of similar logging practices to the Ozette watershed supports the Ozette LFA conclusion that multiple limiting factors are operating and further suggests the relative importance of forest management as a limiting factor may be overstated.			
4744				
4745	Future conditions in the Ozette basin: Although documentation is not in place to support the contention that forest management is a limiting factor for Lake Ozette Sockeye, several factors are operating to ensure conditions are on an improving trend, making restriction of management activities, as proposed by ONP, unnecessary. As a result of the logging history, most of the roads needed for future management are already in place, significantly reducing the level of future road construction. Logging activity is at a moderate level and will continue to be into the future both as a result of stand age and harvest unit size regulations. Road maintenance planning and upgrading are taking place in the basin, with a focus on water quality and fish habitat improvements. The recent upgrade of Washington Forest Practice rules as a result of FFR established expanded riparian protection requirements as well as restrictions on all operations near water; requirements judged sufficient to meet ESA requirements for protection of fish habitat and water quality. Implementation of the LOSRP is expected to eliminate or reduce the influence of other factors, such as predation and effects of coarse woody debris removal, that are judged to be l			
4746	LOSRP implementation is also expected to result in substantial habitat enhancements necessary to quickly reach the goal of harvestable numbers of fish. Since both FFR and LOSRP involve directed, active efforts, they can be expected to support more rapid recovery of this depressed ESU than the passive approach that would occur under ONP jurisdiction.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4747	Arguments against the Lake Crescent park boundary expansion.			
4748				
4749	Available information suggests there is little justification for park expansion in the area of the Lyre River outlet of Lake Crescent. The GMP indicates the purpose of this expansion is for the protection of the spawning areas of the Beardslee rainbow and the Crescenti cutthroat trout, both of which are resident in Lake Crescent except during the spawning period when they enter the Lyre River. The spawning area for Beardslee trout is limited to a 400-foot stretch of the Lyre River above the Lyre Bridge, just downstream of the lake outlet. The cutthroat spawning area extends approximately 1 mile downstream of the outlet to the mouth of Boundary Creek. (Goin, 2002).			
4750				
4751	As they have received little study, life history information for both of these fish stocks, which are endemic to Lake Crescent, is limited. Observations that do exist indicate that spawning counts of both Beardslee and Crescenti trout have declined in recent years. Goin (2002) lists several factors considered to be negatively affecting these fish stocks. These include a loss of spawning area, from logging on Piedmont Creek and from boating and human activity on the long channel in Lake Crescent above the outlet to the Lyre River. These activities apparently result in siltation of spawning gravels downstream of the lake outlet to the river. Goin (2002) also points out that several of the major spawning sites in the Lyre River are associated with logjams, which accumulate gravel, forming spawning areas. These logjams, which are deteriorating and becoming smaller with time, are considered vital for gravel retention and when they are lost, will result in the loss of most Lyre River trout according to Goin (2002). Conversely, Washington Trout, a citizen's group, considered harvesting of Beardslee trout by sport fishermen to be the major cause of their decline (WA Trout, undated).			
4752	Habitat quality was not considered a problem since the Lake Crescent watershed lies almost entirely within the park, which provides protection from habitat degradation potentially associated with land use activities. In response to the urgings of Washington Trout, ONP has modified fishing regulations in Lake Crescent to protect Beardslee trout.			
4753	By virtue of their existence in a protected watershed, and the restricted areas downstream of the outlet of the lake where spawning occurs, it seems unlikely that land use activities, including logging, are threatening these trout stocks. It is not clear to what extent historic land use activities may have influenced habitat, but as outlined above relative to Lake Ozette, forest practices have become increasingly restrictive over the past several decades. The Forest and Fish Rules, discussed above in detail, are considered by federal and state agencies and tribes to be adequate for protection of fish habitat and water quality, and are the standard for forest practices carried out in the private land portions of the proposed expansion area. Of particular significance are the rule requirements associated with road management, with their emphasis on addressing road-related fish habitat and water quality concerns. An additional consideration is that inclusion of this area in ONP is likely to limit efforts to quickly address current problems, such as the loss of the gravel-retaining log jams discussed by Goin (2002). The responses of ONP would likely be passive, and less timely than the active, directed efforts that could occur under current ownership.			
4754	For these reasons, and because the amount of forest land that could potentially influence the spawning areas is extremely limited, especially given the long period between management entries, park expansion to protect these fisheries from forestry-related habitat degradation is, in my opinion, unwarranted.			
4755	Other resources affected by the ONP proposal.			
4756				
4757	Roosevelt elk and black-tailed deer are wildlife species of high interest on the Olympic peninsula both for hunting and for viewing by the local public and visiting tourists. Populations of both of these species are highly influenced by the amount of forage available on a year-round basis (Cook et al 1998). While they occur at low levels within unmanaged forests such as parts of ONP, within the park they tend to be closely associated with natural openings including the alpine zone and areas of natural disturbance such as riparian areas in the valley bottoms and areas of forest mortality from wind throw and disease. Highest populations occur outside the park, however, where larger-scale disturbances associated with timber harvest have created abundant supplies of forage. The shifting mosaic of interspersed foraging and hiding cover areas resulting from timber harvest create ideal conditions on a continuing basis for these species. The absence of timber harvesting, which is expected under the ONP expansion proposal will result in a landscape dominated for many years by middle-aged forest stands, which, because of the limited amounts of available forage, is the least productive stage of forest development for deer and elk.			
4758				
4759	Summary:			
4760				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4761	I believe the proposed expansion of ONP in the Ozette basin and Crescent Lake portions of the park to include substantial acreages of private forest land is unlikely to achieve its stated objectives of habitat and water quality improvement. Compared to several active initiatives already in place, activities occurring with park expansion are likely to be passive, and improvements in critical habitat for Lake Ozette Sockeye, the watershed and water quality of the lake are not likely to occur in a timely manner, if at all. The Forest and Fish Regulations are currently implementing federally approved environmental measures designed to protect and improve fish habitat and water quality.			
4762	Expanded riparian protection and road maintenance and abandonment plans are key activities within FFR directly focused on maintenance and improvement of aquatic resources. At the same time, implementation of the Lake Ozette Sockeye Recovery Plan will target the specific factors determined to be limiting the recovery of salmon, and address those factors through restoration and enhancement efforts. Addressing several of these factors such as predation on adult and juvenile Sockeye and lack of coarse wood in streams will require active directed efforts. Forestry practices, such as thinning in riparian zones can be used to accelerate the development of desired habitat conditions much more rapidly than a passive "let nature take its course" approach.			
4763	Active efforts of this type are not likely to occur under Park management. Importantly, under the Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research element of FFR, monitoring programs will be in place to assess effectiveness of forest practices as well as recovery plan implementation, and will provide guidance for improvements as needs are observed. Black-tailed deer and Roosevelt elk populations are additional resources of high public interest which benefit from the continuation of forest management in the Ozette area and which will likely decline under park management.			
4764	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft General Management Plan and EIS for Olympic National Park. My literature references are listed below. Please feel free to contact me if you require clarification of any of my comments.			
4765				
4766	188261		Olympia	WA
4767	Frontcountry - consider installing covered picnic areas on the coast at Mora and/or other areas that receive a high annual precipitation. Increased visitor opportunities would be a by-product of this construction.			
4768	190809		Auburn	WA
4769	I am delighted to know the Park Service is moving forward with strong intention to improve environmental protection of the Olympic National Forest by means of the Olympic National Parks draft General Management Plan.			
4770				
4771	In developing that draft, I strongly urge the Park Service to:			
4772				
4773	" Establish river protection zones to ensure preservation of critical salmon habitats and natural river processes, as proposed in alternative B;			
4774				
4775	" Recommend federal Wild and Scenic River designation for all 13 eligible rivers;			
4776				
4777	" Recommend restoration of wolf, fisher, and other extirpated species;			
4778				
4779	" Limit development zones inside park boundaries to current uses! New commercial developments, including campgrounds and RV parks should be located outside the park.			
4780				
4781	" Request deferment of controversial decisions related to Wilderness designation until completion of a comprehensive management plan.			
4782				
4783	" Be aware that -- as a matter of public trust -- Park Service managers MUST be diligent in protecting the Olympic National Forest's outstanding natural qualities, especially now, as our population and recreational demand on the park increase, and land use patterns are changing around the park.			
4784				
4785	191223		Forks	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4786	My comments for the Olympic National Park are concerned with the Klaloch area. I strongly urge consideration of ALternative A. However, my concern is your possible adoption of Alternative D, which would relocate Highway 101 outside the park. Relocating Highway 101 is not practical for many reasons:			
4787				
4788	1. How can the WA Department of Transportation deal with that when they a) have no money to improve congestion on I-5 and I-405, b) would be most likely removing DNR forests for this new highway which ultimately robs money from our schools 3) would be polluting many salmon/steelhead streams.			
4789				
4790	2. Highway 101 is a main highway for the timber industry in Washington and to move it would definitely impact that industry.			
4791				
4792	3. Moving 101 would impact home owners (including myself) and businesses unfavorably, or even cause us to lose homes and businesses.			
4793				
4794	4. Closing off the area to the beaches for park visitors only is closing off the most beautiful part of our state to a select few.			
4795				
4796	5. It is less costly to adjust the alignment of Hwy 101 outside the erosion zone.			
4797	188702		Vancouver	WA
4798	I would like to see the olympic national park remain a national treasure by at least maintaining trails and providing adequate park staffing. We dont need commercialization of the park.			
4799	190960	Clallam EDC	Port Angeles	WA
4800	The Clallam netWorks Economic Development Board represents the voices of public and private (business) members including representation from the cities of Forks, Sequim, Port Angeles, Clallam County, the Port of Port Angeles, Public Utility District #1 and Olympic Medical Center. At their August 18, 2006 meeting it was resolved to participate in the public comment section of the report. At the September 19, 2006 Board Meeting, Bill Laitner and his associate presented the plan to the Board for their better understanding of the components. The following are bullets representing the Board's position:			
4801				
4802	We understand and acknowledge the important role that the ONP plays within the region's tourism sector as the most significant draw for visitors to the region.			
4803				
4804	We also accept the fact that the role of the ONP is multifaceted in its efforts to provide protection to the unique resources and wildlife of the ONP while also ensuring a quality recreational experience for all visitors to the park.			
4805				
4806	We believe that maintenance of existing infrastructure and improving visitor access must be a higher funding and implementation priority than expanding the ONP boundaries.			
4807				
4808	We believe that the main focus during the ONP general management planning period should be improving visitor access and their experience in the park by augmenting existing infrastructure with additional bike paths, trails, expanding the use where feasible of mass transit, completion of the Spruce Railroad Trail, expansion of the lodging seasons, development of new campground and visitor facilities. Many visitors come expecting modern facilities capable of adequately serving the existing visitor population, however, many of the ONP's facilities are out dated, overwhelmed and in need of a significant investment in renovation, expansion and modernization. In addition, unless some overwhelming demonstrative and objective analysis indicates a real and present danger to specific unique resources, we are not supportive of the removal of existing visitor points of access to the ONP, or the removal of existing camping sites within ONP.			
4809				
4810	We believe that there must be continued emphasis on fully funding and expanding the park's interpretive programs, while maintaining and improving its current information centers. Visitors are coming to the ONP for a variety of reasons and we expect each visitor to have the opportunity to learn not only about the natural history of the ONP, but also the cultural and historical significance of the region as well. One of the "unique resources" of ONP that we are adamant about the NPS having a duty to protect and increase the population of within the ONP is the interpretative rangers and the backcountry rangers.			
4811				
4812	We applaud the effort of the NPS to ensure adequate security is in place within the ONP, however, we believe that the NPS is presuming that a security ranger can also serve as a "stand-in" interpretive and visitor information ranger which is not the case.			
4813				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4814	We believe that there may be opportunities for the NPS to develop and strengthen working ties with the surrounding communities in addressing the issues of access roads to ONP in unstable areas.			
4815				
4816	We do not advocate for the removal of those access points, but rather believe that working in cooperation and good faith with the local community stakeholders where such roadways exist would be in the best interest of the community, the region and the ONP.			
4817				
4818	With regard to land acquisition, we are not supportive of efforts to expand the park at the expense of the livelihood of others in the community. Any acquisition must be the result of fair, good faith, and honest transactions not involving direct or indirect pressures by the federal government to 'encourage' parties to become "willing sellers." Emphasis on land acquisition should be placed on those land owners who approach the NPS seeking to sell their property due to hardship or those land owners that may be surrounded by the NPS and no longer wanting to own their property.			
4819				
4820	Finally, we applaud the NPS for specifically noting that the ONP staff must be more actively engaged in the communities in and about its boarders. However, if this proposal is adopted in the final plan, ONP should be willing to implement it sooner than later and should focus its involvement in ways that increases the community's understanding of ONP activities while aiding in the marketing of the region to the visiting public.			
4821	190672		Olympia	WA
4822	Letter on File			
4823	190715		Clallam Bay	WA
4824	The proposed changes to the plan for the Northwest Coast Lake Ozette in Washington state Olympic National Park A altenrative has the vote of the citizens and taxpayers of this area. The proposed changes to the plan, which could include removing or limiting access to roadways might adversely affect the ability of disable people to access the park. Also limiting motor boats also would take away the lake heritage of having motor boats on it since the early 1800's.			
4825				
4826	The park plan from 1976 has not been follow by the park administer. The park plan from 1976 stated that log jams made by nature due to floods would be maintained by the park service and removed. This has casue damage to the sockey run on the Ozette River.			
4827				
4828	The park service has built new hosing (bunk house) but, due to lack of funding the park service has limited the crew to maintain the park.			
4829				
4830	The park service campground has become smaller due to lack of park service workers to maintain the campground. The campground needs to be expanded so more citizens and taxpayers can enjoy camping at the lake.			
4831				
4832	The park service do not need to take in more wilderness land when they cannot take care of what they have without the funding.			
4833	The park administer must follow the written plan they have already in place and have not followed since 1976. The park service has broken the rules and laws written.			
4834	Once again please listen to the citizens and taxpayers Plan A alternative ahs the vote of the people.			
4835	Also public transit Bus service to Lake Ozette needs to be provided down the twenty-three mile road.			
4836	Thank you for your time and listening.			
4837	188666		Olympia	WA
4838	Although the plan does address boundary adjustments, it doesn't address privately held lands within the park boundaries. There are several lots inside the existing park boundaries in Oil City and its addition. I presume that there are other in-holdings as well. I realize that efforts were initially made to acquire these parcels, but there have been no recent efforts to complete the acquisitions these parcels. The Park should reach out to the owners of these parcels and the other in-holdings to see if they are now interested in selling or trading for land outside the park boundary. Where the Park does own land outside the park boundary, they should endeavor to make that ownership consistent and contiguous rather than the patchwork they have now.			
4839	190843		None Provided	N/A
4840	I endorse in its entirety Olympic Park Associates' recommendations.			
4841	188156		FLORHAM PARK	NJ
4842	I pick alternative B for natural protection of the entire resources of the park since they belong in the first place to national taxpayers, who have paid to protect this park for eons. I do not think locals are the only ones to be consulted on this, since NATIONAL TAXPAYERS			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4843	HAVE MORTGAGED THEIR HOMES TO PAY TAXES TO PROTECT THIS PARK.			
4844				
4845	I THINK THE FOLLOWING SHOULD BE TOTALLY BANNED IN THIS PARK:			
4846	1. HUNTING			
4847	2. TRAPPING			
4848	3. NEW ROADS			
4849	4. ALL SNOWMOBILE, JETSKI, ORV WHICH POLLUTE THE AIR WATER AND SOIL GREATLY. WHEN THE MANUFACTURERS OF THOSE VEHICLES CLEAN THEM UP, THEN I MIGHT HAVE A DIFFERENT OPINION. RIGHT NOW THEY ARE NOTHING BUT POLLUTING MACHINES.			
4850	6. PRESCRIBED BURNING WHICH RELEASES FINE PARTICULATE MATTER WHICH IS INVISIBLE TO THE NAKED EYE (NOT SMOKE WHICH YOU CAN SEE) WHICH TRAVELS THOUSANDS OF MILES POISONING AND INJURING AMERICANS WITH LUNG CANCER, HEART ATTACKS, STROKES, ASTHMA, ALLERGIES AND PNEUMONIA.STOP POLLUTING AMERICA AND KILLING AMERICANS BY BURNING.			
4851	7. LOGGING.			
4852	190547		Monroe	WA
4853	I want to thank the National Park Service for recommending wilderness			
4854	study for Lake Ozette and Pyramid Peak. I want to thank you, also, for			
4855	establishing marine intertidal reserves along the Olympic Coast.			
4856				
4857	I urge you to expand the boundaries of the park in the Ozette basin, the			
4858	Lake Crescent area, the Queets River corridor, and also in the Hoh and			
4859	Quinault watersheds, and to establish river protection zones, and to			
4860	protect critical habitat for salmon and other wildlife as proposed in			
4861	Alternative B.			
4862				
4863	I believe that both development zones and developed areas should be kept			
4864	at their current sizes as described in Alternative A, and new			
4865	recreational developments should be located outside the park.			
4866	There is no recommendation, despite a favorable study by the U. S. Fish			
4867	and Wildlife Service, to reintroduce wolves to the Olympics, or to			
4868	support ongoing efforts to reintroduce the fisher.			
4869	Finally, I request that, until a comprehensive wilderness management			
4870	plan is completed, controversial decisions relating to designated			
4871	Wilderness be withheld.			
4872	Thank you for this opportunity to be heard.			
4873	190735		Aberdeen	WA
4874	Please continue to make trails available for horse use for us and future generations. I have ridden the Olympic park for 50 years and hope this can continue for my grandchildren.			
4875	Please maintain access for horse trailers and horse campgrounds as much as possible.			
4876	190797		Kingston	WA
4877	I am very much concerned about preserving the natural systems of Olympic National Park. Protecting the wilderness and restoring threatened wildlife is a high priority.			
4878	Thank you for protecting the inter tidal areas on the Olympic Coast an the wilderness study at Ozette Lake.			
4879	Expanding park boundaries at Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault watersheds would protect wildlife and salmon habitats and should be done as proposed in Alternative B.			
4880	All 13 eligible rivers should be preserved to protect critical salmon habitats also proposed in Alternative B.			
4881	Developed areas should not be expanded in the park. New developments are better located outside the park as described in Alternative A.			
4882	It would be great to restore the wolf and fisher to the park.			
4883	Please defer all decisions concerning wilderness until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed and made available to the public view.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4884	Thank you for your concern.			
4885	190681		Bainbridge Island	WA
4886	Primarily in favor of alternative B, Preferred alternative entails excessive development.			
4887	Support additions of maximum acreage for boundary adjustments, particularly South Fork Hoh.			
4888	Reintroduction of wolves is essential for restoration of balance in ecosystem and for Park Service to fulfill mission.			
4889	Protection of rivers and riparian areas must be prioritized over road access. Each major river system is deserving of a wild and scenic recommendation.			
4890	190730	Olympic Forest Coalition	Bainbridge Island	WA
4891	The mission of Olympic Forest Coalition (OFCO), incorporated as a non-profit in 2002, is to protect and restore the forested and aquatic ecosystems on the public lands of the Olympic Peninsula. As such, we have great interest in the revision of Olympic National Park's General Management Plan. We believe strongly that an adequate GMP will prioritize conservation of the park's natural resources (both within and outside designated Wilderness boundaries), avoid all development that would compromise the integrity of these ecosystems, and actively seek out strategies to restore the park to pre-settlement conditions to the furthest extent possible.			
4892	In this respect, we are highly in favor of expanding the park boundaries at Lake Crescent, Lake Ozette, and the Queets River, though the Park Service's preferred alternative (D) is overly modest in this context. Specifically, the proposed boundary adjustments do not adhere to logical watershed boundaries and are insufficient to protect fish species in the lower portions of the drainages in question from logging and roading activities upstream. We recommend enlarging these proposed boundary adjustments to conform with the landscape's hydrologic boundaries, while including additional enlargement of park acreage in the Hoh (inclusion of the SOuth Fork's drainage is especially crucial and desirable) and Quinault watersheds, as recommended in Alternative B.			
4893	Similarly, we strongly support the establishment of marine intertidal reserves along sensitive areas of the park's coastal strip, motorized boat restrictions and a Wilderness suitability study for the Lake Ozette area, proposed Wild & Scenic designation for the Elwha River, expanding educational programs for visitors across the park, and encouraging mass transit alternatives in developed portions of the park.			
4894	OFCO has, however, a number of serious concerns about the preferred alternative. The Park Service's continued devotion to its road system, including those roads within floodplains and with significantly harmful impacts to anadromous fish species, is indefensible. This shortcoming is worsened by the denial of "river protection zone" status to the major streams of the park, which provide critical habitat for ESA-listed salmonids. Moreover, we oppose movement of 1988 Wilderness boundaries for the relocation of problem roads - which should in fact be decommissioned. Given the Park Service's mandate to conserve the public's resources on lands the agency manages, perpetuity of the road system must be made subordinate to adjacent natural, native features (both terrestrial and aquatic). The North Shore Road situation at Finley Creek is a particularly regrettable example of the need for more enlightened road management.			
4895	Alternative D's partiality towards developed recreation and motorized access, at the expense of natural resource protection and species restoration, is also quite troubling. We are very much opposed to proposals to expand development zones from their current size; as evidenced, for example, by consideration of expanding the Sol Duc Campground from 82 to 250 units (the equivalent of making way for a virtual, transient city in the summer months in an otherwise primitive and especially scenic valley). Proposed expansion of commercial concessions yields similar worries, suggesting the likelihood of increased and inappropriate "Disneyfication" of this Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site.			
4896	It is upsetting, as well, that the Park Service did not pursue a needed ecosystem study to inform longer-term decisions, offered no Wild & Scenic River eligibility study for the dozen rivers which would likely qualify (presumably because it would complicate the agency's bias toward road permanence and/or reconstruction in floodplains), overemphasized preservation of semi-historic structures at the expense of Wilderness protection, and once again shortchanged Olympic by failing to complete a timely Wilderness Management Plan.			
4897	Lastly, OFCO's board and membership are unabashed advocates of reintroducing previously extirpated species to the park - particularly the gray wolf. There is no excuse for the Park Service to attempt avoiding a decision on wolf reintroduction in the GMP. It is the agency's clear, legal responsibility to manage the park in such a manner as to maintain its existing natural attributes, as well as to restore those attributes which have been lost through past mismanagement. We cannot urge strongly enough that the Park Service meet its obligations to the public by endorsing and preparing the necessary wolf reintroduction in the near future. Similar urgency is warranted for the planned reintroduction of the Pacific fisher.			
4898	Alternative D's timidity, lack of commitment to Olympic's natural resources and ecosystems, and avoidance of several substantial and pressing issues require significant attention on the part of the Park Service. In the final EIS, we look forward to having these concerns better addressed.			
4899	190696	Merrill & Ring	Port Angeles	WA
4900	Letter on File			
4901	190888	Merrill & Ring	Port	WA

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4902	Letter on File		Angeles	
4903	190078		Sequim	WA
4904	I have read the draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Olympic National Park, and am in favor of Alternative C. I would like to compliment the park service for the thoughtful and thorough document. My husband and I and our family have enjoyed the recreational opportunities of Olympic National Park, especially hiking and camping for over 30 years. My decision to support Alternative C is that the affect would be to enhance and improve upon the experiences we love. It is the only alternative that specifies trail improvements and even additional trails within the front country. I would like to see additional educational displays along the lines of what is available at Mt. St. Helens. I think anytime you educate the public, you increase respect for the environment. It would also be nice to see some improvements to existing campgrounds, possibly adding some electricity hookups if possible, for RV's, which would eliminate the need to ever use a generator, and the resulting noise. Other national parks have more services available for visitors, such as a restaurant.			
4905	What a wonderful ending for a perfect day in the park to have dinner in a beautiful setting. I realize that the parks must provide a secure environment for the native plants and animals, but I feel it is equally important to provide access to the park for peoples' enjoyment. I note that even with the additional services, possible trails and road improvements, Alternative C still uses only 2% of the existing park. The chart showing costs does not seem to take into consideration any revenue generated by increased services. I am sure concessionairs would be contributing a percentage of their profits to the park. Adding a chairlift or two for skiing would certainly generate additional revenue as would camping and entrance fees. I read the preferred alternative D, expecting to agree with it, but I feel Alternative C is the best choice, as it improves upon the activities we loved and enjoyed over the years.			
4906	Dayhiking, camping and interacting with park Rangers has created in my family a true love and respect of nature. We don't step off trails so as not to disturb immature plantings, we keep our voices low so others can enjoy their experience too, and so we don't disturb wildlife. After a hike, we leave the park the way we found it, enriched by the beauty and serenity we experienced. Others we meet along the trails echo our feelings. I think improving the front country of the park while leaving 98% in wilderness, will provide the opportunity for so many visitors to come to love and respect the great national treasure that is Olympic National Park.			
4907	190794	Olympic Environmental Council	Port Townsend	WA
4908	RE: Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft			
4909	GMP/EIS)			
4910	(Please confirm receipt of these comments.)			
4911	The Olympic Environmental Council is a 501(c)(3) organization based on the North Olympic Peninsula of WA State founded in 1990. Our primary involvement is in Clallam and Jefferson Counties.			
4912	A main concern of ours is the portion of the Olympic Discovery Trail (ODT) which will run through the ONP on the north side of Lake Crescent through wooded areas and along the lake's waterfront. (Pages M13-16). The trail runs between East Beach Road and the Fairholme Campground. It is now an existing trail. It is referred to as the Spruce Trail.			
4913	Most likely your Alternative D, point 6 addresses this: "...A universally accessible front country trail would be developed and maintained." We believe this has already been decided.			
4914	Our concerns are the following. First, while we support keeping the trail, we do not support paving it. Paving portions of the Olympic Discovery Trail in Clallam County has a toxic history. Once the trail is paved, weeds will collect through and around the pavement. The maintainers of the trail, likely the ODT volunteers, will want these weeds removed. To date the ODT volunteers have turned to introducing herbicides rather than pulling or another method for weed removal. This has contaminated long sections of the trail in Clallam County and has put in harms way the trail users and the wildlife.			
4915	Here, at Crescent Lake, the herbicide will be transported into Lake Crescent with wind, rain and fog.			
4916	And it will contaminate the trail users and the horses on the parallel trail (assuming a horse trail will be cleared), as well as the land and water local wildlife.			
4917	We understand the need to give bikers a route off of Highway 101. The trail is an acceptable alternative. But paving it creates a biker's trail and not a trail for the public at large; not for joggers or walkers who want ground to walk on, not the main users to date, and not the majority of future users.			
4918	Second, we are concerned about the increase of human traffic on this trail. This is cougar territory, especially in dry weather. There have been several incidents between panther and humans over the years, including with bikers and joggers. Increase in human traffic means more invasion into this cat's natural territory. How will the cougars be protected and how will the humans be protected? What safety plans have been drawn up? When will the public have a look at these plans?			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4919	We oppose paving and, if paving is approved, non toxic methods (and these are available) must be implemented for weed control, perhaps through the use of a steam method. More health and environment harm will come from the use of herbicides than from keeping "front country" bikers on Hwy 101. Too, while this trail invites biker use increase, if herbicides are used anywhere near it, then other citizens -- chemically sensitive and those that want chemical free recreation -- will be unable to use the trail. This is no gain.			
4920	In addition to this trail, we regard that first and foremost, protection of the Park's natural resources and permanent residents -- the wildlife, flora and fauna -- be of primary concern and protection. An ecosystem study should be undertaken to provide necessary groundwork for long-term decision making.			
4921	We support the expansion of park boundaries in five critical areas (Lake Crescent and Ozette Lake, and Hoh, Queets, and Quinault watersheds) in a manner that conforms with watershed basins to help recovering salmon populations and downstream fish species from destructive upstream timber harvest and road building, and to help protect critical elk habitat. The Park Service should perform Wild and Scenic River eligibility studies for all of the rivers in Olympic National Park, and ensure that the management plan protects endangered salmon.			
4922	We support intertidal preserves established on the park's wilderness coast to protect biologically rich marine areas.			
4923	We support "river protection zones" to maintain the natural functions of coastal rivers and to keep wild salmon populations intact,.			
4924	And we support the reintroduction of extirpated species, like the wolf and fisher, to complete a nearly intact ecosystem.			
4925	We support the use of mass transit opportunities to the most used park entrance sites which host interpretive, camping and hiking opportunities. This could be done through a contract with the local bus companies in each county. The buses should be retrofitted with the least polluting technology. Mass transit, hopefully, would reduce the number of autos entering at each point, hence would diminis auto exhaust. It could also be a way to control the visitor number in a park region at any one time.			
4926	But road access in the park, including flood plains, should not be allowed where they can impact salmon habitat and the natural river process. Wilderness boundaries should not be moved on active flood plains to maintain problem roads.			
4927	We agree there should be a wilderness suitability study for Lake Ozette and that Wild and Scenic River designation is appropriate for the Elwha River. Are there other rivers that should be eligible for the Wild and Scenic River status?			
4928	To help reduce air pollution, camp fires should be discouraged.			
4929	Expansion of educational and interpretive programs is a good idea. However, we do not support increasing infrastructure foot prints.			
4930	Please do not expand development zones from their current size. The Sol Duc campground, for instance, should not be expanded from 82 campsites to 250, or anywhere near this number.			
4931	We do not favor expansion of commercial concessions within the park. Rather, we support local businesses having this business. The Hurricane Ridge Visitor Center (HRVC) should not be expanded. The food service there should either be eliminated or replaced with one that offers healthy menu. Fatty food and food with little nutritional value should not be allowed in our national parks, even more so since the U.S. claims to want to eliminate obesity and foods which elevate this. In fact, we don't need a food service at the HRVC. The public should be encouraged to bring their own food or support the local eateries. Doing away with this HRVC service would decrease trash and water and electricity costs.			
4932	In park areas that are quite a distance from community resources and maintain food services, these service areas should maintain their present foot print and should provide healthy food choices; again, not foods that push obesity, heart attacks, strokes, diabetes, etc.. A positive example is the present service at Lake Crescent Lodge.			
4933	The plan overemphasizes historic preservation at the expense of natural resource and wilderness protection. This point of view should be reversed.			
4934	At this juncture in time, a wilderness management plan should be completed before wilderness decisions are made.			
4935	190917		Tumwater	WA
4936	Letter on File			
4937	191044		Fort Collins	CO
4938	For over 40 years I have supported the mission and efforts of our National Park Service and enjoyed these lands that have been so beautifully protected for animals, plants, and people. As a long-time visitor to the Ozette area of Olympic NP and a former employee of the Youth Conservation Corps (1976 & 1978), I am greatly concerned about the Draft General Management Plan, specifically regarding the changes proposed for the Lake Ozette area.			
4939	I strongly oppose Alterantive B, C, & D for the reasons listed below and ask you to please implement Alternative A only, for no change.			
4940	- Most of the land wihtin the proposed boundary adjustment /acquisition of 12,000 acres has already been and continues to be clearcut and woudl thus be inappropriate for wilderness designation.			
4941	- The land woudl be removed from tax rolls, to the detriment of Clallam County and Washington State Public Schools.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4942	- Most of the private land owners within the area slated for NPS acquisition do not wish to sell their property and homes, many of which have been in their families for generations! I sincerely hope our NPS would not engage in serious misuse of eminent domain, which would not only further what has become a dangerous precedent in the U.S., but would also tarnish the fine reputation the Park Service has enjoyed since its inception.			
4943	- Re-designation of Ozette as a Wilderness Area would unfairly restrict current responsible use of the lake and some trails by visitors, many of whom have limited access to more remote areas due to age and physical disability.			
4944	- Lastly, as overburdened as NPS already is due to budget cuts and understaffing, it would be better use of funds and other resources to concentrate on lands already under your jurisdiction.			
4945	Please continue to use your precious time, money, and human resources appropriately in the care of our current pristine lands, and support only alternative A.			
4946	My concerns and opposition to B, C, & D are being forwarded to my elected national politicians. Thank you.			
4947	191045		Seattle	WA
4948	We are frequent travellers to the Lake Ozette watershed of Olympic National Park in Washington State, camping and hiking in a truly unique area, and are adamantly opposed to Alternative B, C, and D of the Draft General Management Plan. Supporting Alternative A only for no change.			
4949	We believe the experiences we have had and hope to continue to enjoy in this area will be seriously curtailed by the proposed land acquisition and subsequent boundary adjustments the National Park Service is intending to implement per the Draft GMP.			
4950	We have, for the past 70 years, appreciated all the myriad experiences wilderness areas and parks have presented us with, and have brought up our children with the same principles and ethics appropriate to respecting natural ecosystems within the public corridor as we have always upheld.			
4951	The motives behind, and manner in which, the National Park Service is attempting to proceed with its acquisition of private land is abhorrent and in direct conflict with moral environmental management of park lands.			
4952	Continuing to concentrate on environmentally correct methods of management of existing park land, in keeping with the particular social and economic needs of the historic establishment, should be the sole focus of the National Park Service for Lake Ozette.			
4953	Please refrain from invoking eminent domain on private property.			
4954	Please do not implement Alternatives B, C, and D at Lake Ozette.			
4955	190836		Seattle	WA
4956	I have been privileged over the past forty some years to have both played and worked in Washington State's National Parks and have always been thankful for the experiences and opportunities the park system has afforded me.			
4957	However, I am greatly concerned regarding the changes that are being currently proposed in the Draft General Management Plan for Olympic National Park, specifically those affecting the Lake Ozette area.			
4958	I strongly oppose the Draft GMP Alternatives B, C, and D for Lake Ozette and support only Alternative A for no change.			
4959	The proposed boundary adjustment for the Lake Ozette watershed poses political, social, and economic issues that have been poorly addressed. The announcement to the public of the intended boundary changes set off a catalyst for continued, rapid logging by private timber companies of much of the acreage the Park Service is proposing to designate wilderness. Concern for preservation of this land would have been better served decades ago, yet has in fact created more devastation of what now provides no wilderness experience.			
4960	Conscientious caretaking of existing National Park Service land, in keeping with the mandates of The Wilderness Act of 1964 and the right of the public to public land, and in discrete cooperation with the private historic community, is where all emphasis of management should be placed.			
4961	Ultimately invoking eminent domain on private property sets a very dangerous precedent, one which this nation has repeatedly and mistakenly engaged in throughout history, and one which hopefully the National Park Service will never be implicated with.			
4962	Please continue to serve the public and the wild harmoniously.			
4963	Please do not implement Alternatives B, C, or D in the Lake Ozette watershed.			
4964	191187		Fenton	MI
4965	Letter on File			
4966	191176	North Olympic Peninsula Visitor and	Port Angeles	WA
4967	Letter on File			
4968	190795		Waldorf	MD
4969	I have reviewed the Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Olympic National Park.			
4970	I support the proposed alternative as described in the plan. The plan would provide for a reasonable balance of use of the National Park while preserving natural resources and values.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
4971	I particularly support the proposed land additions and boundary adjustments as contained in the preferred alternative.			
4972	Obviously, a great deal of time and effort has gone into the plan. The National Park Service is to be complemented for their hard work and comprehensive approach to park planning.			
4973	190448 - MASTER FORM LETTER		Battle Creek	MI
4974	I want to thank the National Park Service for the opportunity to provide my comments on thoughts on this significant change to the Olympic National Park.			
4975	First, I specifically believe that none of the four alternatives adequately addresses the issues behind the problems at the Olympic Hot Springs.			
4976	I do strongly support the amendments proposed for consideration by the Nativist Society. For the record, they are restated as:			
4977	A. Retain the soaking pools at the Hot Springs site but reduce the overall number to three or four, located near the main source. This will improve cleanliness by offering less restriction to flow. It will help rehabilitate the runoff area, reduce the impact of			
4978	use and enhance the integrity of the environment.			
4979	B. Contract the maintenance of the resource to an experienced caretaker. This approach has been implemented with great success by other agencies responsible for managing hot spring resources in the Pacific Northwest.			
4980	C. Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail beyond the Altair site. This is similar to an item proposed in Alternative B			
4981	of the draft of the General Management Plan.			
4982	Additionally, as a long time nativist I would sincerely hope:			
4983	1. Clothing-optional use which is traditional at this site in the park is allowed to continue. Clothing optional use is an environmentally friendly, low impact use of the resource.			
4984	2. Nativists are responsible stewards of public lands.			
4985	3. "Rehabilitation" of Olympic Hot Springs does not require that the resource be made unusable for those seeking remote recreational experiences.			
4986	Other details of Alternative D, the NPS-preferred plan, accommodate traditional uses, and the traditional use at Olympic Hot Springs should be among those that are retained.			
4987	As a long time nativist and supporter of the National Park system I believe nativist and NPS efforts should work together to create a safe, healthy and enjoyable park environment that may be utilized by everyone, including nativists.			
4988	Thank you for allowing me to comment on this important issue.			
4989	188126		Port Angeles	WA
4990	Dear Olympic National Park,			
4991				
4992	As a field science educator at Olympic Park Institute, I recently watched old-growth forest be cut down for development inside Olympic National Park. My friends from Forks were outraged. One, who works at Rayonier, said that not even Rayonier would consider cutting its			
4993	old-growth forest any more.			
4994	These giant grand firs were replaced by a classroom for Olympic Park Institute. This park partner needed more indoor space to provide			
4995	field science education to its participants - park visitors. But this building did not have to come at the expense of old-growth forest			
4996	because there was already open, disturbed space nearby. But the disturbed space was inside a historic area, and was thus, in the eyes			
4997	of park planners, not appropriate for new development. The park chose to locate the new building in the old-growth forest rather than the historic area.			
4998	This decision was a mistake. It goes against the ethos of the Organic Act. As the park looks ahead with the GMP, emphasizes on conservation			
4999	must trump recreation and development of facilities. I understand that this goes against the current philosophies of the department of the interior (see "Who's Ruining our National Parks" by Michael Shnayerson in Vanity Fair Online at			
5000	http://www.vanityfair.com/commentary/content/articles/060626roco04). But these ideas of putting recreation on par with conservation go			
5001	against the entire history of the National Park Service and particularly Olympic which is, above all else, a wilderness park.			
5002	The preferred alternative of the GMP ought to do the following (which it already includes):			
5003	* Establishes marine intertidal reserves along sensitive areas of the coast			
5004	* Recommends expanding the park's boundaries in the Ozette basin (12,000 acres), Lake Crescent area (1,640 acres), and the Queets River corridor (2,300 acres)			
5005	* Recommends a wilderness suitability study for Lake Ozette.			
5006	* Recommends Wild and Scenic River designation for the Elwha River.			
5007	* Expands educational and interpretive programs.			
5008	* Encourages mass transit in heavily used developed areas, and			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5009	* Proposes development of short all-accessible loop trails throughout the			
5010	park's front country.			
5011	But it can, and should, also include:			
5012	* Ecosystem study undertaken to provide necessary groundwork for long-term decision making.			
5013	* Decision to reintroduce extirpated wolves to the Olympics despite a favorable government study of the issue, or to remove non-native wildlife.			
5014	* Wild and Scenic River eligibility study for 12 rivers that for designation.			
5015	* Emphasis of natural resource and wilderness protection at the expense of cultural preservation (which is the opposite of the current proposed alternative).			
5016	* Wilderness management plan (which has not been done 20 years after designation of the Olympic Wilderness)			
5017	And the GMP should DEFINATELY NOT include:			
5018	* Denying "river protection zone" status to the the park's rivers, many of which provide critical habitat for a number of federally listed threatened and endangered salmon stocks.			
5019	* Maintaining all road access in the park, including floodplains, regardless of impacts on salmon habitat and natural river process. Continues bulldozing Finley Creek channel in the Quinault area. And recommends moving wilderness boundaries on active floodplains to maintain problem roads.			
5020	* Proposed boundary expansions which do not conform to watershed boundaries and			
5021	are inadequate to protect downstream fish species from destructive upstream			
5022	upstream like timber harvest and road building.			
5023	* Greatly expanded development zones from their current size. The Sol Duc campground, for instance, can be expanded from 82 campsites to 250.			
5024	* Allowing expansion of commercial concessions within the park.			
5025	(The above points have all been recommended repeatedly by Olympic Park Associates and others who work to maintain the ecological integrity of Olympic.)			
5026	Additionally, and most importantly, the GMP should recognize the rights of indigenous peoples to the land managed by Olympic National			
5027	Park. The Treaties signed by the US government and the indigenous peoples of the Olympic Peninsula have not been honored by the US			
5028	government. The tribes relinquished lands in exchange for services which have not been provided. The US government has not followed the treaties it agreed to. Thus, as the current steward of these lands, the National Park Service should recognize its current role as guardian of lands that do not belong to it, and plan for the return of these lands to indigenous communities that can care for these lands for future generations.			
5029	This mandate, supported by treaty law, is compatible with the conservation path outlined above. It is not compatible with development of the park.			
5030	Thank you for your time. I look forward to hearing more from you about the future of our home.			
5031	190561		Bellevue	WA
5032	I am commenting to urge the Park Service to always error on the side of retaining wilderness. The US is a free market, capitalist economy. That economic system has produced and at an accelerating pace, is producing tourist opportunities for the citizenry. However, I am not aware of a single instance where free market entrepreneurs have created a significant wilderness opportunity that is available to the public. Only the federal government is in the position to preserve significant wilderness enclaves and even it has greatly limited ability to do so. Given the ability of private enterprise to develop "tourist" facilities/opportunities, there is simply to excuse for the federal government to cede a single square inch of the very little wilderness terrain that remains. To do so is short sighted in the extreme, and those entrusted with the responsibility of overseeing and managing our public lands would be criminally negligent to allow it to occur. There is no shortage of tourist facilities in this country. There is an appalling shortage of wilderness. What little there is must be preserved for P.S. I greatly resent the format of this hearing which forces citizens to present their commentary in isolation from their community (i.e. written, tape recorded, emails). The town meeting is an American tradition that serves a very important function in allowing members of the community to express their opinion to their neighbors and be forced to listen to the opinions of others. It facilitates thought, debate, and passion. I have noticed over the past few years that government agencies are adopting more and more subtle strategies that allow them to control public hearings. Obviously this is done because it is more comfortable for the staff. Unfortunately it is very corrosive to democracy and public participation/interest in civil affairs. I must assume these control techniques are taught to agency staff because I recently attended a City of Seattle "public hearing" and they utilized exactly the same format used at your hearing here in Seattle. I think you should be ashamed of your fear of the people whom you supposedly serve and who fund your paychecks.			
5033	You should also be ashamed of being willing to participate in the undermining of our rapidly disintegrating democracy. Let the people speak with their voices!			
5034	191021	Howard County Bird Club	Ellicott City	MD
5035	The Howard County Bird Club appreciates the opportunity to submit the following comments on the draft General Management Plan for Olympic National Park. Members of the Howard County Bird Club have visited Olympic, as it contains important habitat for birds and other forms of wildlife.			
5036	The value of Olympic National Park to the nation is never clearer than at the park boundary, where the devastated, clearcut lands outside the park remind us what would have happened to the whole Olympic landscape, had the park not been established. Our members have witnessed this devastation outside the park. Hence, we believe that protection and restoration of the lands within the park should be the highest priority in this General Management Plan.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5037	The Howard County Bird Club is an organization with a membership of more than 200 families and individuals in Howard County, Maryland. We are a chapter of the Maryland Ornithological Society, a nonprofit, statewide organization of people who are interested in birds and nature. Our purposes include promoting the study and enjoyment of birds, promoting knowledge about our natural resources, and fostering their appreciation and conservation. We offer field trips, bird counts, and conservation projects. The club has raised and donated over \$50,000 for wildlife habitat preservation during the past 25 years. Our members travel all over the United States to visit national parks and other federal lands on birding and nature-watching vacations. We spend dollars on food, lodging, guide services, books, and souvenirs to support the local economy wherever we go. Birding is one of the fastest-growing outdoor sports.			
5038	Wildlife Values			
5039	Olympic National Park is well known for its great diversity of wildlife habitats, from Pacific coastal waters to high mountain peaks. Over 300 species of birds and 70 species of mammals have been recorded in the park, including 18 endemics. UNESCO has designated the park as an International Biosphere Reserve and as a World Heritage Site. The American Bird Conservancy has identified Olympic National Park as a Globally Important Bird Area, and Peter W. Thayer lists it as one of the top 100 North American birding hot spots.			
5040	To make the most of wildlife values in Olympic, we urge the National Park Service to emphasize the restoration and protection of the natural ecosystem of the Olympics. This park may be the best opportunity in the lower 48 states to have a complete, intact ecosystem functioning naturally. The preferred alternative (Alternative D) misses several opportunities to restore and protect the ecosystem, as we will point out below. We favor the reintroduction of the fisher and wolf in Olympic and more vigorous efforts to restore the degraded rivers.			
5041	Development Zones			
5042	We support the measure in Alternative D to introduce voluntary public transportation in congested traffic areas of Olympic park. Comparable systems of shuttle buses or snow coaches are in use at Yosemite (3 locations: Yosemite Valley, Wawona, and Tuolumne Meadows), Yellowstone, Grand Canyon south rim (4 routes), Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Harpers Ferry. They enable visitors to avoid the hassle of traffic jams and the search for a parking spot. They could be a great improvement on conditions at Hurricane Ridge (snow coaches in winter, Obstruction Point shuttle in summer), Sol Duc Hot Springs, and Hoh River Rain Forest, and they would head off greater traffic problems in the future.			
5043	We oppose the expanded development zones proposed in Alternative D at Hurricane Ridge, Sol Duc Hot Springs, and Elwha River all key visitor-use areas accessible by roads. Hurricane Ridge is where most visitors experience the high mountains and observe the birds, mammals and plants found there. It is in the sub-alpine zone, where the meadows and fir forests intermingle, and where buildings and roads can only mar the landscape. Please keep Hurricane Ridge natural, and use the existing road, visitor center and concession building as the only intrusions. At Sol Duc and Elwha, the scarce, low-elevation floodplain lands bearing old growth forest are a treasure for visitors, a wild setting that is readily accessible for bird-watching and easy hiking. Expansion of buildings and facilities there should be avoided. The gateway communities outside the park are already providing lodgings and campgrounds to serve park visitors and should be encouraged to expand those businesses to meet growing demand, without imposing any impacts on these key areas of the park.			
5044	Wilderness Areas			
5045	Olympic is fortunate that some 95 percent of the park has already designated as wilderness by Congress. We favor wilderness studies for Ozette Lake, Pyramid Peak ridge north of Lake Crescent, and the boundary additions including Ozette Lake, so these areas can receive consideration for protection as wilderness.			
5046	Alternative D contemplates maintaining or rehabilitating up to 50 structures and altered landscapes in the wilderness areas of the park, on grounds they are "historic." The existence of old buildings does not mean that they are automatically historic structures that must be maintained. Here in our region, Shenandoah National Park has several areas designated by Congress as wilderness, and we know of only one cabin maintained in them (the historic Corbin cabin). Many decaying remnants of old cabins can be seen in the Shenandoah wilderness areas, dating from the years when these mountains were settled and farmed. The Shenandoah example should inform your decision for Olympic.			
5047	We question the partition of Olympic wilderness into three zones (Primeval Zone, Primitive Zone, and Wilderness Trail Zone). The Wilderness Act does not call for any such zones. The zones could imply that some parts of the wilderness will be less protected than others. Some of the facilities mentioned in the DEIS appear inconsistent with the Wilderness Act.			
5048	We urge NPS to resolve this and other issues of wilderness stewardship in a wilderness management plan.			
5049	Boundary Additions			
5050	We favor the boundary additions described in Alternative B, in which lands essential for park purposes would be added around Ozette Lake following the hydrographic divide, north of Lake Crescent in the Lyre River and Boundary Creek watersheds, and on the Hoh, Queets and Quinault Rivers. All these additions will yield important benefits for wildlife values, including fish spawning waters, lowland elk habitat, and many species of birds associated with those habitats. The reduced additions in Alternative D would leave parts of the watersheds open to logging, with resultant impacts on the downstream lands inside the park.			
	Rivers and Coastline			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5051	The ecological health of the 13 rivers in Olympic National Park is important to visitors who go there to observe nature. The rivers should receive more protection in the plan. We favor the "river protection zones" proposed in Alternative B, to give higher priority to restoration of natural riparian and aquatic ecosystems, the native runs of salmon and steelhead, and the birds and mammals that are part of those ecosystems. The "armoring" of river banks and channelization (as at Finley Creek) work against naturally functioning ecosystems.			
5052	We urge NPS to carry through with studies of all 13 rivers under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, instead of only the Elwha. It is now 38 years since the WSR Act became law, and it is high time the rivers of the Olympic Range were given the consideration and protection they deserve.			
5053	We favor the "intertidal reserves" proposed in Alternative D for the Olympic coast. The intertidal habitat is essential for birds, as the invertebrates found there are a vital food source for migrating shorebirds as well as resident species. The intertidal reserves would fill a gap in protection between the Marine Sanctuary and the protected landscape above high tide.			
5054	Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.			
5055	190806		Port Angeles	WA
5056	RE: Comments on the Proposed Draft for ONP Expansion			
5057	Dear Sir or Madam:			
5058	We feel compelled to address our concerns regarding this proposed expansion of the Olympic National Park. These views are our own, and do not represent any official Clallam County stand on this issue, even though we serve in the capacities as Treasurer and Assessor of Clallam County, Washington.			
5059	Impact to Clallam County Revenue			
5060	In 2006 Clallam County received roughly \$0.21 per acre in PILT money to help compensate the county for the over 500,000 acres of Federal lands with in our boundaries. Once this proposed 60,000 acres would be incorporated into the ONP boundary, this is about all we would be able to expect annually in revenue off this land.			
5061	The potential loss of tax revenue even with the land in the current special tax classifications of timberlands, classified and open space, would provide greater return than the PILT, plus they have the harvest potential that increases our excise tax from the timber sales. Over the years, this reduction in revenue would be a significant loss to our county.			
5062	The loss of existing and potential jobs is another significant impact to us. Some of the timber companies have estimated the 60,000 proposed acres could provide a sustainable yield of 50-60 million board feet of lumber per year forever. This is enough lumber to supply a local mill for at least a year. The average mill typically would have at least 140 employees, which in turn would probably generate another 80 related service jobs. These jobs are all considered family wage earning positions. Every family wage earning job is important in our county, as we have lost so many in recent years. These jobs would never be regained if these 60,000 acres were added to the ONP.			
5063	The jobs listed on pages 167-169 of the Plan indicate service jobs are the major type of job in Clallam County. According to the 2005 Clallam County Profile produced by United Way and Health and Human Services of Clallam County, the 2004 median household income in Clallam County was \$41,108 compared to the average of the State of Washington at \$51,762 per household. (see attached 2005 Profile stats) The western portion of our county struggles for every family wage earning job they can maintain. The potential loss of these 220 jobs would have a significant impact annually to Clallam County, and especially this western region of our county.			
5064	Recognition of Forestland Practices			
5065	We think our DNR and local timber companies should be commended for their efforts to comply and implement all of the mandates involved with fish and wildlife habitat and the water quality through Forest Practice Rules and HCP. Their stewardship of the land to ensure the forestland protection while trying to balance this renewable resource economically has been a tremendous challenge. Their earnest efforts should be acknowledged and applauded rather than ignored by your draft plan.			
5066	ONP Shortfalls			
5067	On page 64 of your draft plan identifies \$6.6 million in unmet needs parkwide, plus a reduction of 30 full time employees in the ONP business plan. Is it prudent to think adding an additional 60,000 acres to an already over extended and currently unfunded budget is a fiscally sound move?			
5068	Being life long residents of this area, we would fear more restrictions of access to these supposed public lands that were meant for everyone's enjoyment. This fiscal issue alone should be sufficient to dismiss any idea of any proposed ONP expansion. We believe ONP and the public would be better served by concentrating on their current assets and trying to reinstate the accessibility of their current resources for public use rather than closing existing facilities that the public has enjoyed for decades. There are plenty of examples of pristine areas already within the park without having to return everything to it's natural setting and then denying the public the accessible opportunity to enjoy "their" park.			
5069	Conclusion			
5070	We are opposed to this proposed expansion. These are our personal opinions. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for the Olympic National Park.			
5071	190725		Millersville	MD

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5072	These comments are submitted for consideration on the draft general management plan for Olympic National Park. My brother-in-law has visited and worked at Olympic park and he has told us about your planning project. Our six children (ages now 7 to 11) love wild country, and we all hope Olympic National Park will still be wild when they grow up and explore our beautiful land for themselves.			
5073	We compliment the National Park Service for adding the Intertidal reserves to protect the ecology along the ocean shore and for suggesting wilderness studies at Crescent Lake and Ozette Lake. We also favor your proposal to study and implement optional public transportation at Hurricane Ridge, the Sol Duc, and Hoh River. Public transportation has done an excellent job of relieving traffic at Harpers Ferry National Park, near us.			
5074	We cannot agree with your proposal in Alternative D to expand "development zones" in the Elwha and Sol Duc valleys and on Hurricane Ridge, involving more commercial facilities and tripling the size of campgrounds. It would be better to help private enterprises provide rooms and campgrounds, outside the park, so these precious park lands can serve day uses such as sightseeing, picnicking, fishing, and hiking.			
5075	We urge you to move forward boldly with park additions as outline in Alternative B, including Ozette Lake (the entire watershed), Crescent Lake (Boundary Creek and Lyre River), and elk and salmon habitat along the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault Rivers, totaling 87,000 acres. We also urge you to designate the river protection zones in Alternative B and conduct Wild & Scenic River studies on all 13 rivers that were found eligible.			
5076	Thank you for considering our thoughts. We wish you well in this planning effort.			
5077	190835	Quinault Indian Nation	Tahola	WA
5078	Letter on File.			
5079	191180	Quinault Business Committe	Tahola	WA
5080	Letter on File			
5081	189434		None Provided	N/A
5082	All trails that are currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness area which			
5083	are open to stock should remain open to stock in the ONP General Management			
5084	Plan and not be zoned as either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone. I ride in the mountains primarily in the Cascades and Olympics. I am always a responsible horse rider. I feel I do a lot for the wilderness and forests that I visit each year. I always carry a pack saw and do a lot of trail clearing. In fact most hikers think I work for the park or forest service depending where I am at because I am often sawing trees out of the trail. It has been very disapointing to me over the years to find more and more places banning horses from various areas. I am amazed at what is often blamed on horse riders when I see hikers leaving some of the biggest messes, ie. litter/garbage. Horses are part of our history and roots. Most of the general public gets excited to see a couple of hor ses in the mountains. These days, I see less and less horsemen in the backcountry. My fear is we are soon going to be banned from these beautiful places much like Mount Ranier has done. I have seen trails that were not heavily used go into total disrepair after horses were banned. You don't often see hikers pack in large pack saws or rakes or shovels unless they are contracted or employed by the park service. Please allow us to continue using the trails and don't ban grazing in areas that currently allow it.			
5085				
5086	190732 - MASTER FORM LETTER		Port Angeles	WA
5087	As a frequent user of the Olympic National Park I would like to express my concerns with the preferred alternative "D" draft plan.			
5088	1. The plan "D" calls for restricting access to visitor constructed pools at Olympic Hot Springs. Since the removal of the Olympic Hot Springs facilities by the ONP I have been a frequent user of the existing pools. They provide enjoyment for thousands of ONP visitors annually. Although the ONP has done very little to provide access to this area, it is one of the heaviest utilized areas of the park year round by all age groups and families. It is one of the few park areas accessible by bicycle. In the over twenty five years of using this facility, I have not been aware of any serious crime accident or other problem at this site. It is a great outing for any time of year and any hardy group or individual. The park needs to leave this jewel alone and as is.			
5089	2. The plan "D" calls for removing the existing facilities at Kalaloch and moving them inland. This facility was constructed prior to park ownership and is one of the last things they haven't ruined. It is a historical landmark prized by the general public. It is an irreplaceable establishment and location. It is the only store and fuel facility south of Forks and north of Queets River. It needs to be left just as it is and where it is.			
5090	3. The plan "D" calls for adding 2300 acres of land in the Queets watershed. The park and teh Queets Indian Tribe already own almost the entire Queets valley. I am a strong proponent of multiple use recreation areas. The DNR portion of the Queets is used by thousands of hunters, fisherman, campers, brush pickers, berry pickers, loggers and others annually on a year round basis. No fees are required and DNR regulations apply, which are designated for the sportsman. The park roadway to the upper Queest river has been out since fall 2005 and they haven't done one thing to repair it. In facty, they have restricted foot access to the upper Queets because it is a hazard. This is ridiculous. Foot travelers have used this area long before the park was established. It is one of the nicest valleys in the park and the public is locked out for an indefinite period into the future.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5091	4. The plan "D" calls for adding 1200 acres in teh Lake Ozette watershed. The park presently owns and controls three sides of this lake and has done nothing to add access in these areas, where the general public could enjoy the lake without use of a water craft. Again, I must state that I am a strong proponent of multiple use recreation areas. The property presently owned by the DNR and private timber companies is open year-round (excluding fire season) to the general public, including loggers, hunters, brush pickers, berry pickers and hikers. It is maintained by the timber companies and this area provides enjoyment for thousands. The park has no plan to maintain access to this area, which would be a severe loss to the general public. Existing property owners would lose access to their property by road, which is not right.			
5092	5. The plan "D" calls for restricting boat usage on Lake Ozette. Lake Ozette is the third largest natural lake in the state. It is unique in that it already has very limited access. Limiting the access further is absolutely ridiculous. I have spent periods of a month at a time at this lake and you rarely see another boat. The plan does not restrict motor usage on Lake Crescent, Cushman, or other lakes in the park where usage and safety concerns are far greater than on Lake Ozette and Lake Ozette is far less accessible. In addition, motor boats are required by property owners and the general public in order to enjoy this huge lake. Elderly and disabled folks could not enjoy the lake at all without motor boats. There is a public safety issue in accessing the lake for both property owners and general public if motor boats are restricted. Is the NPS going to stop using motor boats? Of course not; they need access for safety reasons and so do the landowners and general public.			
5093	6. The plan "D" calls for removal of boat ramps at Swan Bay and Rayonier Landing. The existing facilities, as rudimentary as they are, provide access and enjoyment to the majority of the present lake users. They have been what Lake Ozette is all about before the NPS acquired these facilities. The NPS has done next to nothing to improve them during their tenure. These are the closest access points for private property owners, and are shelter in rough weather. Removing these facilities woudl restrict lake usage and be a serious safety concern to private property owners and the general public.			
5094	7. NPS past and present performance, ownership and public treatment. The NPS already owns most of the Olympic Peninsula. There is ample land, facilities, and opportunities within its present boundaries. Further acquisition of land is unnecessary and borders on federal control beyond state desire or need. The park can no, has not, and will not maintain the property and facilities they already own. Access roads are non-existent or in terrible condition. The trail system depends largely on volunteer staff.			
5095	Facilities such as Wamellia Lodge, East Beach, La Poel, Ruby Beach, Olympic Hot Springs, Sol Duc Hot Springs, the Elwha dams and countless others have been historically destroyed or soon will be. Water use restrictions have been made at Lake Crescent after strong opposition by lake users. Fishing regulations on Lake Crescent have destroyed the fishery on teh lake for sportsmen. Catch and release fishing regulations within the area have ruined it for any serious fishermen. The park has no serious desire to be flexible in their management and restrictions in an area that covers the entire Olympic Peninsula. Family heritages have been lost, dreams taken away, and generations of hard work destroyed.			
5096	8. Clallam and Jefferson County Tax Base. The NPS does not contribute to the Clallam and Jefferson County state property tax bases. Private ownership and the DNR contribute to the state property and school tax system. Every acre taken from this tax base to a non-contributer such as the NPS puts more burden on a state tax system that already over burdens the private property owner. This should be a major concern to all Washington state residents.			
5097	9. State Timber Revenue. Up until this present proposal (alternative "D"), the property owned either by the DNR or private timber companies has provided revenue through logging to state schools. The federal forst service logging program at this point is non-existent. Taking this amount of private and DNR ownership out of the tax base is not acceptable. Although the NPS plan calls for a land swap, with the present state government it can not be guaranteed there will be equity in this agreement. It will be a one way, one time give way to the NPS and a loss of state revenue forever.			
5098	In closing, for the reasons stated above, I am a strong proponent of the status quo alternative "A". Anything short of this is more federal control and restriction of land that is presently multiple use and should remain in the state and private ownership.			
5099	190998			
5100	I wanted to send a much more involved response, but, with the deadline today, this little is better than nothing.		None Provided	N/A
5101	Generally, I think the park is on the right track.			
5102	My biggest desire is for the Park to enhance backcountry use in ways that don't threaten the wildest parts of the park. To me this means adding to the trail system on the periphery, and in places where two existing trails could be connected. I don't advocate opening up new, pristine trailless area to trails, only increasing the density in areas where they already exist.			
5103	Examples that come to mind:			
5104	connecting the Badger Valley Trail down Grand Creek to 3 Forks			
5105	connecting the North Fork Sol Duc trail to Happy Lake Ridge Trail near Boulder Lake			
5106	Maybe connecting Lillian River trail up to the Grand Valley Trail on Lillian Ridge.			
5107				

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5108	I know this document is meant to be general, so to put it short: mandate that the forthcoming wilderness plan enhance the trail system, adding more miles on the periphery, and in areas where trails already exist.			
5109	Thanks for the opportunity to respond.			
5110	190903		Idyllwild	CA
5111	My siblings and I each own 5-acre parcels at Lake Ozette, WA. I would desire to see a no-action alternative for managing the park. My desire is to see Lake Ozette managed as is currently being done (Alternative A)			
5112	191164	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington	Ellensburg	WA
5113	Letter on File			
5114	190932		Sequim	WA
5115	I love Olympic National Park. The Park is one of the main reasons I live on the Olympic Peninsula. I'm writing to you today both as a concerned local citizen and as a professional scientist specializing in habitat restoration. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.			
5116	I'm deeply concerned that the Preferred Alternative (D) places too much emphasis on visitor access, expanded development zones and commercial concessions, and retaining road access in river corridors. Alternative D will compromise the wilderness character of the Park. To maintain the long-term ecological integrity of the Park as one of the largest intact wilderness preserves on the planet, the emphasis of the management plan has to be on protection of natural ecosystems and restoration of critical ecosystem functions.			
5117	The importance of protecting and restoring the ecological integrity of the Park is only magnified as population and recreational demand on the Park increase. It is my professional opinion that Alternative D is inadequate to ensure the vision of why Olympic National Park was originally created and later designated as a World Heritage Site and International Biosphere Reserve. Two of the weakest elements of Alternative D are river protection and salmon protection.			
5118	I urge you to establish river protection zones, as proposed in Alternative B, to ensure critical salmon habitats and natural river processes are preserved. I know from first hand experience that we're always better off protecting intact habitats than trying to restore degraded ones. The Park's past and ongoing practices of maintaining year-round road access through bulldozing and placement of rip-rap (for example on "problem" roads such as the Hoh, Quinault, Queets, and Dosewallips) is unsustainable and could threaten the extinction of federally listed threatened and endangered salmon stocks in peninsula rivers. Based on the Park's past decisions relative to road maintenance and construction, I have little faith that all necessary measures will be taken to minimize adverse effects to wild salmon stocks unless protection measures are explicitly stated in the GMP. Under the current management regime, roads trump salmon--even listed species.			
5119	On a more positive note, I commend you for advocating the establishment of marine intertidal reserves along sensitive areas of the coast. Establishing river protection zones in concert with marine intertidal reserves would provide far better protection to recovering salmon stocks than currently exists.			
5120	I urge you to re-evaluate the 13 rivers in Olympic National Park that have already been determined in a preliminary analysis by the National Park Service to be eligible for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers system. These rivers are clearly of Wild and Scenic caliber and provide some of the best remaining habitat for wild salmon in the lower 48 states. The GMP should make specific recommendations to Congress on which rivers to include in the national system.			
5121	I strongly recommend that you defer all decisions related to designated wilderness until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed. I had the privilege of spending seven days this summer in Gates of the Arctic National Park . At 8.5 million acres, Gates is nine times larger than Olympic National Park and has a wilderness management plan in place. A similar plan for Olympic National Park is long overdue. Twenty years after the designation of the Olympic Wilderness, controversial decisions are made in the absence of a wilderness management plan. Forcing controversial decisions into the DGMP--like maintaining and restoring structures in designated wilderness and zoning the Olympic Wilderness into use zones without providing any details or scientific rationale--pre-empts a meaningful wilderness management planning effort. It's disingenuous, likely illegal, and only continues to fuel speculation that ONP has a cultural resource protection agenda they want to keep from public scrutiny.			
5122	For the sake of salmon, rivers, and the ecological integrity of the park, please limit developments zones inside the Park boundaries to current uses. Any new commercial developments, campgrounds, or RV parks should be located outside the park. The adverse impacts of large-scale developments within national park boundaries are well documented at other parks like Yosemite and Yellowstone. Let's avoid these same mistakes at ONP.			
5123	I echo and support the detailed analysis and recommendations of American Rivers and Olympic Park Associates. I hope their voices--and mine--are heard loud and clear in this process. The preferred alternative in the current management plan is simply inadequate. As both organizations highlight, Alternative D conveys a pronounced bias toward increased development and motorized access, while simultaneously appearing to make road maintenance and cultural resource protection sacrosanct. I would add that Alternative D ignores existing scientific data on salmon ecology and river processes that could and should be used to provide the maximum possible protection to at-risk species and habitats. Alternative B is the only alternative the provides adequate protection to salmon and rivers.			
5124	Finally, it's incomprehensible to me that an executive summary was not provided. No one can be reasonably expected to wade through 400-plus pages. If indeed you welcome public comment, please make it easier to do so in the future.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5125	190837		Seattle	WA
5126	I am a frequent vsitor to the Lake Ozette area of Olympic National Park and oppose Alternatives B, C, and D of the Draft General Management Plan and support Alternative A only for no change.			
5127	The majority of the land in question to be acquired has been clear-cut and woudl not enhance the public wilderness experience. Sale of this land continues to support and benefit private timber companies in direct conflict with the ideals of proper management of wilderness areas.			
5128	Drawing new boundaries and restricting certain activities currently allowed woudl prevent access by the private sector to rightfully owned land. Ethical consideration by the National Park Serivce of private and public ownership of lands within or bordering park and/or wilderness areas should be maintained.			
5129	Jurisdiction over existing park land in a manner such as to cooperatively and morally serve private, public, and wilderness interests rather than acquiring more than the Park Service can successfully maintain should be the only focus of the National Park Service.			
5130	Please do not implement Alternatives B, C, or D in the Lake Ozette area of Olympic National Park.			
5131	191010		Seattle	WA
5132	I endorse much of your Preferred Alternative (D), but encourage you to			
5133	strengthen it by making changes that address issues brought to your			
5134	attention by the Olympic Park Associates. I am particularly concerned			
5135	about their report that			
5136				
5137	* No ecosystem study was undertaken to provide necessary groundwork			
5138	for long-term decision making.			
5139				
5140	and that the draft reflects			
5141				
5142	* No wilderness management plan was completed (18 years after			
5143	designation of the Olympic Wilderness) yet numerous controversial			
5144	decisions about wilderness -- such as maintaining and restoring between			
5145	29 and 50 historic structures in designated wilderness -- are included.			
5146	What I especially like:			
5147				
5148	* Establishing marine intertidal reserves along sensitive areas of the			
5149	coast.			
5150	* Expanding educational and interpretive programs.			
5151	* Expanding the park's boundaries in the Ozette basin, Lake Crescent			
5152	area and Queets River corridor.			
5153	* Recommending Wild and Scenic River designation for the Elwha River			
5154	My summary:			
5155				
5156	I love the natural beauty of the Pacific NW. The Olympic National Park			
5157	is an amazing wilderness and natural resource for the area and the			
5158	whole world. We can expect a great many pressures to threaten this			
5159	great park. I think the Park Service must go many extra miles to obtain			
5160	the best possible professional advice from scientists on how to			
5161	preserve wilderness and Park area ecosystems, while allowing some level			
5162	of access. Then the public should be educated about this information in			
5163	order to build support for the best stewardship possible, and to help			
5164	them experience and appreciate the Park.			
5165	190840		Port	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5166	I support Alternaive A. ONP is continually raising fees while failing to upkeep maintenance. It makes no sense to add more while not being able to take care of existing lands.		Angeles	
5167	I suggest using any funds available to re-open the Allens Bay Trail to the Norwegian Memorial at Lake Ozette.			
5168	Leave the Swan Bay and Ranier boat launches as they are. Do not ban motor boats on Lake Ozette.			
5169	190559		Stanwood	N/A
5170	Ladies and Gentlemen:			
5171				
5172	As a long-time visitor to Olympic National Park, I would ask that any management plan give priority to preserving the rare wilderness jewel that Olympic is. Olympic has a nearly complete ecosystem and harbors vast tracts of magnificent old-growth forest, abundant wildlife, and rich salmon runs.			
5173	Increased development and expanded campgrounds are not in the best interest of natural resource protection. The future of this magnificent park is at stake and park managers must give the highest priority to measures that strengthen protection for this beautiful and wild park.			
5174	190743		Port Angeles	WA
5175	Olympic Hotsprings is a unique resourse that should be enhanced, not eliminated. User built pools should remain usable for visitors.		None Provided	N/A
5176	190557			
5177	I have lived in Western Washington all my life and have many wonderful experiences traveling in the Olympic National Park. We have traveled the trails via horseback and foot and have found those experiences a very important part of enjoying nature, peace and quiet. I support opening of the Queets and Dosewallips roads for the enjoyment of those who seek time in nature.			
5178	188558		Bothell	WA
5179	Clearly the preference is Alternative B. Too many national parks are overrun with "improvements", and millions of visitors annually because of it.			
5180	LEAVE THIS PARK ALONE!!!! Olympic National Park is a hikers paradise precisely because it is not choked with people. Can't there be one park that focuses on the wildlife with the reasonable access that is already in place today?			
5181	There is plenty of access for the nonhiker via Hurrricane Ridge, the Hoh, Soleduck, Ozette, Staircase, etc.			
5182	In other words, there is nothing to improve, other than to maintain what we got, a simply spectacular park.			
5183	The improvements envisioned by NPS will put too much pressure on the wildlife, overwhelm many of the trails and ruin the back country experience so easily available in Olympic National Park			
5184	190952	National Parks and Conservation Association	Seattle	WA
5185	RE: Comments on Olympic National Park's Draft General Management Plan			
5186	Dear Superintendent Laitner:			
5187	The idea of the National Parks is powerful and touches upon universal themes, hopes and beliefs such as wilderness, union, and struggle. More than 200 nations have copied our model. Some say that the National Park idea is one of the greatest gifts America has given to world culture; the National Parks Conservation Association agrees.			
5188	Organic Act			
5189	"To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such a means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (Organic Act 16 USC sec 1).			
5190	In 1916 Congress passed the Organic Act. This Act contains the precedent setting idea that the United States would protect its nationally significant irreplaceable resources in a National Park System. Furthermore, the Act makes clear that one of the NPS highest priorities is to provide recreation opportunities, however that recreation is to be limited to those activities which leave the resources and values contained in the park system unimpaired for future generations. This is the filter that all NPS decisions must flow through regarding the Olympic National Park general management plan (GMP).			
5191	Greater Good Alternative			
5192	NPCA applauds the National Park Service's (NPS) effort at Olympic National Park to create a uniform and modern plan. Because of the vast array of natural and cultural resources the NPS must protect and changes in technology and society's needs, we are highly encouraged by the NPS effort to create a guide that reflects current trends and conditions. The NPS draft management plan is a significant step in achieving the NPS mission; we offer the following suggestions to aid the NPS in preserving all the resources of Olympic National Park from impairment.			
5193	To that end, we support the Greater Good Alternative (Guarding Resources, Transportation, Gateway communities and recreation Opportunities for our Decedents). This alternative, among other things, calls upon the NPS to finalize a plan with suggestions as contained in our Olympic "State of the Parks Report." A copy of that report is included with our comments.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5194	Specifically, we ask the NPS to:			
5195	" Increase natural resource research and monitoring. Research projects should include post dam removal on the Elwha River, long-term monitoring of spotted owls, marbled murrelets, and Roosevelt elk. Studies should also focus on the impacts of adjacent land use.			
5196	" Acquire lands and habitat critical to wildlife, recreation and cultural resources.			
5197	NPCA is especially pleased to see the NPS' preferred alternative includes several boundary adjustments including areas around Lake Ozette, Lake Crescent and Queets. We specifically support the NPS' proposed plan to acquire an additional 44,000 acres of private forestland to exchange with the state of Washington for mineral rights within the park.			
5198	However, we also encourage the NPS to consider the additional boundary adjustments as contained in Alternative B. In particular, NPCA supports additional adjustments in the Hoh and the Quinault areas.			
5199	Federal investment in National Parks has a significant positive impact upon regional economies. According to a recent NPS study it's estimated that national parks generate nearly \$5 of economic benefit for every tax dollar invested in park budgets. At Olympic alone, federal investment results in more than \$100 million in benefit to gateway communities as well as supports nearly 2400 local jobs. See Appendix 2 for more on this impact.			
5200	" Support the removal of mountain goats, as well as examine the reintroduction of extirpated species such as the fisher and wolf.			
5201	Mountain Goats, a non-native species, are of particular concern in Olympic National Park. First introduced in the 1920's, the Mountain Goat population has been estimated to be as large as 1,100 animals. Recent estimates put the number at between 230 and 325 goats. These animals can negatively impact native ecosystems through grazing, wallowing, trampling, and eroding soils.			
5202	NPCA is pleased to see the NPS is working with the US Forest Service, the state of Washington and several Indian tribes to improve techniques for estimating goat populations. We encourage the NPS to take the lessons learned from these efforts and immediately apply them to future goats counts.			
5203	According to the NPS' 2006 Management policies, Sec. 4.4.2.3 the Park Service will actively undertake efforts to restore listed native species. NPCA is also encouraged to see the NPS is already engaged in a process that might ultimately lead to the reintroduction of the Fisher, a small weasel-like animal that is extinct in Washington state. NPCA supports this process. See Appendix 3 for NPCA's comments on the draft Fisher plan.			
5204	In addition, we ask the NPS to begin a process to examine the reintroduction of the grey wolf to the Olympic peninsula. Wolves once roamed the Olympic peninsula but systematic hunting, trapping and poisoning eliminated them by the mid 1930's. Reintroduction of gray wolves has been suggested on at least four occasions since the 1930s. Most recently, a 1999 study found that the Olympic peninsula might be a suitable site for wolf reintroduction.			
5205	According to Defenders of Wildlife, there are significant ecological benefits to wolf reintroduction. Most notably, wolves provide a population check upon large ungulates such as deer, moose and elk. Moreover, wolf reintroduction has been shown to have positive economic benefits. According to John Duffield, an economics professor at the University of Montana, Yellowstone wolves generate roughly \$70 million in regional benefits. The Olympic Peninsula could expect similar benefits.			
5206	Some may oppose wolf reintroduction citing concerns such as human safety. However, the Oregon Wolf Advisory Committee states that while wolves can pose a threat to human safety "generally, attacks by wild wolves on humans are a rare event and fatal attacks are very unlikely." See Appendix 4 for more on wolves.			
5207	" Increase the study of and planning for park cultural resources.			
5208	In particular, NPCA encourages the NPS to complete an archaeological study to describe and evaluate the condition of 99 percent of the park's 622 identified sites; an update of the 1988 Archaeological Overview and Assessment; surveys and evaluations of historic archaeological resources, a historic preservation plan to address all structures in the park that are at least 40 years old; and an updated List of Classified Structures that includes all of the park's historic structures.			
5209	" Create Intertidal Reserves			
5210	Olympic National Park protects more than 65 miles of undeveloped Pacific Coast. The coast is a mixing zone of southern and northern Pacific intertidal species. Additional protection for this area was afforded through the establishment of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary in 1994. However, NPCA is concerned about linkages between intertidal and nearshore environments and habitat for special species like the northern sea otter. These concerns relate to erosion and increased sedimentation loads from the mainland on the nearshore environment, as well as the effects of potential over harvest of marine organisms.			
5211	The ecological and economic benefits of intertidal reserves and marine protected areas are numerous. According to Christy Bell of the University of Santa Cruz, intertidal areas provide unique research and teaching locations. These reserves can also produce economic benefits by better preventing fish population crashes that force broad closures.			
5212	In addition, intertidal reserves are likely to benefit marine mammals such as the Orca and Sea Otter, as well as shorebirds and other mammals like the black bear. Specifically, intertidal reserves can benefit these species by providing undisturbed habitat and food sources. Intertidal reserves also serve as an ideal "outdoor research lab" for studying the impact of activities such as shellfish harvest and predation upon near shore ecosystems. See Appendix 5 for more on these benefits.			
5213				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5214	As such, we urge the NPS' to include intertidal reserves as called for in Alternative C in its final alternative.			
5215	" River Protection Zones			
5216	Olympic's rivers and streams are critical components of a healthy park. NPCA asks the NPS to establish river protection zones as contained in Alternative B. These zones will best ensure that critical salmon habitats, natural river processes, recreational opportunities and economic benefits are protected. In addition, we urge the NPS to recommend that all 13 eligible park rivers be included within the federal Wild and Scenic River program.			
5217	" Wilderness Designations			
5218	NPCA is disappointed that the GMP does not include a comprehensive wilderness management plan. As such we ask the NPS to defer wilderness designations until a comprehensive wilderness management plan is completed.			
5219	Conclusion			
5220	The Park Service's draft GMP for Olympic National Park is a significant step in the right direction. NPCA applauds the NPS for the time and energy that went into the drafting of this document. Yet, we urge the Park Service to adopt NPCA's "Greater Good" Alternative which calls for among other things: 1) increased natural resource research and monitoring; 2) adjustment of park boundaries to adequately protect resources, wildlife and gateway economies; and 3) creation of intertidal reserve zones.			
5221	Sincerely,			
5222	Sean Smith			
5223	Regional Director			
5224	190556		Seattle	WA
5225	Greetings:			
5226				
5227	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft General Management Plan (dGMP) for Olympic National Park.			
5228	This plan will guide management policies and decisions in the park for the next two decades and possibly longer. During that time one must expect significant increases in visitor-days and in public-use pressure on the park's natural environment. For that reason it is crucial that this management plan emphasize, above all, the National Park Service's mandate to protect the park's natural resources. The National Park Service's preferred alternative, (D) is weak on park protection, strong on recreational use, and in my opinion too encouraging of motorized use.			
5229	The following, in my opinion, are the most glaring deficiencies in the dGMP.			
5230	1. Flawed Wilderness management. The absence of the long-overdue Wilderness Management Plan is a glaring deficiency in this draft general management plan. This absence virtually guarantees that the 95% of the park that is designated Wilderness will suffer from inadequate and/or perverse management (see #2, below), including numerous threats to the integrity of the Wilderness that are actually proposed in this dGMP! What further proof could there be of the need for a Wilderness Management Plan?			
5231	This dGMP guarantees half-baked, insufficient protective management of Wilderness, and should return to the drawing-board and stay there until the Wilderness Management Plan is complete.			
5232	2. Preservation of structures in Wilderness. A recent court decision clearly mandated that Wilderness be afforded a higher legal priority than historic preservation. In blatant disregard of that ruling, the draft plan proposes to repair/preserve dozens of structures and cultural sites.			
5233	This is a flagrant example of perversity in wilderness management. It is also a sign of precedent-setting empire-building within the National Park Service that could have detrimental effects throughout the National Park System.			
5234	3. Over-management in riparian zones. Olympic National Park has perennial conflicts between rivers and roads, as snowmelt annually washes out the roads and trails. This draft document would sanction continued bulldozing, road construction and rip-rapping in riparian zones, with known deleterious effects on threatened fish habitat and huge costs for annual road restoration. In addition, this sort of riparian restoration eliminates the possibility of Wild and Scenic River status for a dozen Olympic rivers that would otherwise qualify.			
5235	The GMP needs to recognize the inevitable washouts and to put in place a policy that permanently removes roads from the river, even if this means removing the roads and replacing them with trails that are out of the flood zone.			
5236	4. Commercial zones. No additional concessions should be granted within the park. Commercial activities should remain outside the park.			
5237	5. Watershed protection. Alternative B does a better job of protecting intact watersheds in order to ensure habitat preservation for threatened fish and wildlife.			
5238	I would like to commend the National Park Service for the following positive elements of the dGMP:			
5239	1. Extending the boundaries at Lake Crescent, Ozette, and Queets.			
5240	2. Wilderness designation for Lake Ozette.			
5241	3. Reintroducing top predators (wolf, fisher).			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5242	4. Creating a marine intertidal protective zone.			
5243	5. Creating some accessible loop trails in frontcountry.			
5244				
5245	Please include these comments in the official record of public input and consider making the above changes in the DGMP.			
5246	190791		Rancho Cucamong a	CA
5247	This is an e-mail requesting that you strongly consider the proposal by the Naturist Action Committee with regards to the Olympic Nat'l Park/Olympic Hot Springs.			
5248	We are naturists and visitors to your state and have yet to use this site but intend to, in the future, with close friends that live near by. Please work closely with the NAC is resolving the issues at hand so a solution to the issues at hand with the Hot Springs is resolved amicably between the naturists and the National Parks.			
5249	Members: AANR, TNS and NAC			
5250	191014		Sequim	WA
5251	I am a resident of the North Olympic Peninsula with great personal and professional interest in Olympic National Park and its management. From a personal perspective, I appreciate the wilderness attributes of this park above all others. That we can drive many miles into the heart of the park year round is not as important to me as its value as a sanctuary for wild aspects of this crowded globe we live on. The experience of hiking in undisturbed watersheds is vastly more important to me and, I believe my children as well, than that of visiting settlers' structures (for example).			
5252	On the professional side, I am a hydrogeologist for Clallam County and feel it is crucial that the Park does all it can to improve and restore the full natural function of hydrologic and other natural systems within its jurisdiction. (Implying expansion of park boundaries to include areas critical to this goal.) I am very concerned that setting non-preservation priorities now could create a dangerous precedent as climate change accelerates and pressure increases for quick technologic "fixes" -- potentially without thorough environmental review.			
5253	I realize there are competing mandates regarding management alternatives -- thus the need for public input on four proposed alternatives, A-D. In summary, I don't feel that any of the four proposals go far enough to strongly protect what wilderness remains or restore wilderness lost. Please consider this brief letter a request that wilderness values be weighted more heavily than cultural or access priorities as you craft a final plan.			
5254	190926		Port Angeles	WA
5255	I write to offer my comments, as a voting US citizen, with regard to planning for the management of Olympic National Park.			
5256	Of primary importance in the park's mission is the preservation of natural systems integrity (i.e. ecosystem health, wildlife protection, wilderness values) in this World Heritage Site park. The comfort luxury and accomodation of visitors and of commercial interests should have been of far lower priority. Despite pressure from Bush appointees on park service administrators, it is your sacred duty to resist those pressures and serve the broad interests of the public good. In their care, rejecting additional development and visitor pressures are crucial to your mission of preserving the land in perpetuity, without compromise.			
5257	Therefore, alternative D, because it is contrary to the park's mission, must be rejected in favor of option A (alternative) which does not increase development in the park, but instead continues to concentrate on preserving the natural assets which confer to Olympic its exceptional value as a park. Please do not succumb to corrupt political and commercial interests and betray the trust place in you by the american people.			
5258	190671		Woodinville	WA
5259	I am a property owner on Lake Ozette and am very concerned about the access to my lot. It is a boat in only house and Swan Bay is the closest launch. Restricting motorize boat wi be very detrimental to the care and upkeep of my property. I have two young children that love to visit Lk Ozette. By turning Swan Bay into day use only, I would have to navigate the entire north end of the lake to get to my property. The current alternative (A) is working very well and could (should) continue as is. Alternative (D) still states some restrictions on motor boats. I guess I can agree with the idea of restricting large, high HP boats, i.e. racing boats, boats over 28', loud jet boats. It would be totally obserd to restrict all motorized boast. The transportation of tools and materials to maintain my building would be impossible without the use of a motorized boat. Further more, and most important, would be the safe transportation of my family.			
5260	If I am forced to park at the north end of the lake, it would be a long and dangerous boat ride to my property. As we all know the wind can really toss the lake surface and trying to row or nurse a low powered boat through the waves could prove to be disastrous. Another thing to point out is that closing Swan Bay to overnite parking will put unnecessary pressure on the only remaining overnite launch. More parking will need to be developed which only decreases the current tranquility that exists today. Please give us the chance to enjoy and maintain the property as we have been for the last 22 years. We pay our taxes and work together to keep Lake Ozette available to everyone. We do not need restrictions to keep it beautiful. I believe that Alternative A is the proper alternative, Alternative D will work well , but without the restriction on Swan Bay and the use of motorized transportation.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5261	190977	Bellingham Bares	Bellingham	WA
	Hello! I'm writing in regard to the proposed changes to the Olympic Hot Springs area of the park. My friends and I often travel to Olympic National Park (a distance of well over a hundred miles) specifically for the hot springs. We prefer being clothing optional in nature; it feels natural, it's low impact, as we respect the resources and are concerned stewards of any area we enjoy (not only for all the usual reasons, but also for practicality; it's hard to enjoy being bare outdoors if you have to beware of broken bottles, etc!). We're concerned that rehabilitation means removal, which would be terrible as these are some of the most beautiful hot springs I've been to! We don't believe any of the four proposed alternative(A,B,C,D) management plans adequately addresses Olympic Hot Springs.			
5262				
5263	Please consider the following points:			
5264	1) Keep soaking at Olympic, but reduce the number of pools at the site to three or four, located near the main source. This would keep flow-through high, maintaining cleanliness. It would help rehabilitate the runoff area, reduce the impact of use and enhance the environmental integrity.			
5265	2) Contract the mainenance of the resource to an experienced caretaker. This is very effective with other hot springs in the pacific NW, such as Goldmeyer Hot Springs.			
5266	3) Change the road (Olympic Hot Springs RD) to a trail beyond the Altair site.			
	Please consider that rehabilitation does not require that the resource be made unusable for those of us seeking more remote recreational experiences (without the hot springs, I wouldn't be making the trip to the park, as sharing space with rv families is not a natural experience for me). Other details of the NPS preferred plan, (D), accomodate traditional use and the tradtional clothing optional use at Olympic Hot Springs should be retained. Thanks! Roman Stadler			
5267				
5268	190839		Port Angeles	WA
	I live in Port Angeles, Washington and am a lifelong hiker/backpacker/ hunter/fisherman/photographer and lover of the outdoors. During my 35 year career in the Coast Guard I was stationed in Alaska four times and have experience in many parts of the National Park System (Crater Lake/Mt. Lassen/ Yellowstone/ Glacier/ Denali /Olympic and others). Here in Port Angeles, I am a frequent visitor to Olympic National Park as I hike various trails at least once a week. The focus of the National Park Service should be to preserve the parks we have and maximize the ability of citizen taxpayers to enjoy park experiences. Every decision made should be considered through the prism of "do the benefits achieved justify the costs involved?"			
5269				
5270	Having read and reviewed the Draft General Management Plan for ONP dated May 2006, I find myself in support of Alternative C, with some reservations.			
	Any suggestion that the NPS needs MORE property to manage is silly. Over and over again we hear that the Park Service has insufficient people and funds to deal with the existing system. Locally, the trails that we hike regularly receive only occasional maintenance and the hiker is constantly faced with deadfalls and erosion which significantly reduces trail enjoyment. Trail maintenance is not expensive for the most park. Interestingly, I volunteered to help with this maintenance and was willing until I learned that I would have to endure a TWENTY HOUR chain saw course before I could do so.			
5271				
	Buried in the Draft Management Plan is the skeletal structure for further efforts to rid ONP of the Rocky Mountain Goat. Goats are identified by the NPS as an 'exotic species' and threaten the very heart of ONP with their devouring of rare and endangered plant species and resulting erosion. I have obtained and read the Goat Study dated May 30, 2000 and titled "Review of scientific material relevant to the occurrence, ecosystem role, and tested management options for Mountain Goats in Olympic National Park." The scientists actually were not able to arrive at agreement as to the origin of the ONP Goats. They also did not agree on the causes of the erosion problem normally attributed to the Goats. The Goats are a very attractive animal to grace our park...fun to see and quite at home in their surroundings. Whether or not they occurred naturally or were introduced is not important to me. Their stubborn slow expansion despite previous efforts at eradication is evidence that they are perfectly suited to their surroundings. Tourists love them. I do too.			
5272				
	I was a witness to the effort in 1989 to eliminate the Goats. My wife and I, here in Port Angeles househunting, visited Hurricane Ridge for the first time. Goats were being darted from helicopters and then hauled to the ridge in cargo nets for 'transplanting'. The effort was anything BUT humane. The poor terrified animals had no idea what was happening. They were stressed beyond their ability to survive and many did not.			
5273				
5274	Leave the Goats alone! They are at home in the Olympics and belong there. Even IF they were introduced, that happened before the NPS came into existence. They were here first!			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5275	<p>Finally, the plan to remove the two dams on the Elwha River is a mistake of epic proportions! There are dozens of good reasons to leave the dams intact and few that justify their removal. I deeply resent the expenditure of millions and millions of taxpayer dollars in this effort when the payoff is so vague. The plan to remove the dams was made by people and can be reversed by people. The dams predate the NPS. Stable ecosystems have built up on both lakes in the nearly 100 years since their construction. The hydroelectric power produced by both dams is not insignificant. A carbon footprint analysis of what will be required to replace the power produced shows that a substantial pollution increase will occur. Removing the dams and draining the lakes will destroy the existing ecosystems, cause a mess of huge proportions and create a veritable cottage industry of people on the payroll who will be restoring, repairing, planting, removing silt and who knows what else. All this at monumental costs to the taxpayer...costs that will undoubtedly continue to escalate out of sight and dwarf current estimates.</p>			
5276	<p>One of the selling points on the dam removal proposals when I first heard of them (1989) was restoration of the legendary Elwha River King Salmon runs. This is an interesting issue. If we are convinced that we know how to restore salmon runs, how about first demonstrating that by restoring salmon runs on some of the still undisturbed rivers on the Olympic Peninsula? And, if restoring salmon runs on the Elwha is considered so important to the NPS, why hasn't something been done in the ensuing 17 years (or perhaps longer) as an interim measure. Like, for example, fish ladders around the two dams?</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Management Plan. I hope my comments are considered.</p>			
5277	191153		Tacoma	WA
5278	Letter on File			
5279	190668		Edmonds	WA
5280	<p>Resource protection or preferred alternative look good to me. Would like for you to consider a trail hut system for the longest trails that have no intermediate access since carrying supplies for five days or more requires expedition style outfitting. Also improves access to the older visitor. This would be my one improved visitor access comment. Thanks.</p>			
5281	190832	Naturist Action Committee	Shoreline	WA
5282	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to offer public comment on a small portion of the General Management Plan for Olympic National Park (ONP) in Washington State. I'd like to address only Olympic Hot Springs, otherwise known as Boulder Hot Springs or Triple 21 Hot Springs. This natural water source flows into Boulder Creek, a tributary of the Elwha River near the northern border of ONP.</p>			
5283	<p>I am writing for the Naturist Action Committee, the "political" adjunct of The Naturist Society. TNS is a national organization that promotes and defends non-sexualized, responsible nude recreation on appropriate public and private lands. Many naturists (skinny-dippers, nudists, etc.) have enjoyed Olympic Hot Springs over the years, and many of them have contacted NAC recently regarding the present General Management Plan. The nude use - given what the ONP Park Planner and Deputy Chief Ranger at the site have told me - is not an issue at Olympic Hot Springs. However, many naturists in the Pacific Northwest are concerned that ONP may opt to destroy all of the existing pools at the springs in an effort to bring the site back to a more "natural" state, to reduce litter, to make the water more sanitary, and to offset problems associated with overuse (e.g. illegal use of mountain bikes, and introduction of artificial objects such as carpeting and cement blocks).</p>			
5284	<p>After speaking on the phone with various ONP officials and two local hot springs experts, the Naturist Action Committee wishes to urge ONP to include the following in any action it takes at Olympic Hot Springs.</p>			
5285	<p>A. Retain soaking at Olympic Hot Springs, but reduce the number of pools at the site to three or four, located near the main source of water. This will improve cleanliness by offering less restriction to flow and allow water to move more efficiently through the limited number of pools and out to Boulder Creek. It will also help rehabilitate the runoff area, reduce the impact of use, and enhance the integrity of the environment.</p>			
5286	<p>B. Contract the maintenance of the hot springs resource to an experienced caretaker. This approach has been implemented with great success by other agencies responsible for managing hot spring resources in the Pacific Northwest, such as at Cougar Hot Springs in Oregon.</p>			
5287	<p>C. Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail beyond the Altair site. This is similar to an item proposed in Alternative B of the draft of the General Management Plan.</p>			
5288	<p>Rehabilitation of Olympic Hot Springs does not require that the resource be made unusable for those seeking remote recreational experiences. Other details of Alternative D, the NPS-preferred plan, accommodate traditional uses, and the traditional use at Olympic Hot Springs should be among those that are retained.</p>			
5289	<p>Naturists in this region are well aware of their responsibility in helping to maintain the ecological integrity and social health of this gem of a site. The Naturist Action Committee has already begun to develop a group of volunteers in the region who wish to assist ONP with any cleanup, trail maintenance, or other work that the Volunteer Coordinator (Maggie Tyler) thinks appropriate.</p>			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5290	Thank you for your time. The Naturist Action Committee looks forward to working with ONP in any way we can to preserve both the human use and environmental soundness of Olympic Hot Springs.			
5291	Please feel free to contact me if you have nay questions regarding the Naturist Action Committee or our interest in Olympic Hot Springs.			
5292	190216		White Salmon	WA
5293	I would like to see greater emphasis placed on managing the park as a wild ecosystem. There is far too little truly wild habitat left in our nation, and being able to visit this type of environment is a treasured experience for me and many people I know. I would like to see as little development (roads, buildings, concessions, etc.) in the park as possible. We should not be turning our national parks into Disneylands.		seattle	WA
5294	190634			
5295	Of the 4 options available, I prefer B, favoring the natural environment. Of all our national parks in washington state, I believe that Olympic Park represents the very best in terms of wide diversity that mother earth gave to us in the northwest. To not take this gift as the primary purpose of the Park is simply too present-time-focused. To give it over to "private partnerships" is being short-sighted. Our children's children will appreciate our choices today to preserve the natural environment.		Tacoma	WA
5296	190623			
5297	As a fairly new (5 years) transplant to the northwest from Illinois, I'm			
5298	amazed at the sense of pride and ownership I feel for the natural beauty and			
5299	resources of our national parks in Washington.			
5300	Please do all you can to protect the Olympic National Park and it's			
5301	surroundings from new development!		Seattle	WA
5302	188658			
5303	I support implementation of Alternative B for Olympic national Park. The most important and unique aspect of Olympic is its pristine natural condition. Implementation of Alternative B does the most to support and even improve the natural state of Olympic's environment.			
5304	190992		None Provided	N/A
5305	I am most greatful to be given this opportunity to give input on the 25 year plan for ONP. National Geographic Mag. and others laud the pristine wilderness of this park. As a contributor to the National Parks Foundation and other groups that support our parks I know that our parks face pressures of fewer dollars during these times. It is my sincere hope that this park with its pristine nature can be spared the theme park approach that has taken Yellow Stone and others. Rather than turning this park into a place for more parking lots, campsites and tourist facilities lets build upon this world class rainforest park by acquireing more land for the park especially along its 13 or so river systems to the sea. Last year my wife and I backpacked for five days from the North Fork of the Quinault River over Low Divide and out the Elwha River. We wanted to see the Elwha River before the two dams are taken out which will restore the spawning grounds to those mighty Chinook Salmon of old. For this national park, this is the direction we should take.			
5306	I am so happy to see what is happening here and expect to go visit the Elwha again in the decades ahead. It would be nice to see aquisition of more shoreline and the reintroduction of mammals such as the Fisher and Grey Wolves to help restore the ecosystem. It is my hope that the vision for the next twenty-five years includes the deserving one of the next one-hundred years in keeping this gem wild.			
5307	One final note: I was initially given a non-working website by the ONP info. desk ie. olym_gmp@nps.gov On calling back I was given http://parkplanning.nps.gov which is also a non-working site. I did not try the fax offered at 303-969-2736. My fear is that many citizens who wanted to make comment never made it through the hoops. I tried to make comments before the initial deadline of Sept. 15, but was told the deadline had been extended to Sept 30, which is todays date.			
5308	191173		Port Angeles	WA
5309	I wish to thank the NPS for the conserdable skill and work that went into preparing the management plan. The Park photos are beautiful.			
5310	Alternative Plan D appears to be a good balance between resource protection and visitor opportunities.			
5311	For more resource protection, I would prefer the boundary adjustments detailed in Plan B to be incorporated into Plan D.			
5312	To curtail human impact and pollution, I would like to see sustainable mass transit to all frontcountry areas ASAP.			
5313	I think increased visitor educational programs are very important. I believe the people will want to protect the park more if they understand it's ecosystems and can experience it's beauty personally.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5314	Olympic National Park is irreplaceable to me. The Park is where I go to connect with nature, and to refresh and restore my spirit. I can't imagine my life without the incredible beauty and peace I find in the park.			
5315	190814		None Provided	N/A
5316	To the National Park Service:			
5317	We are writing you today in regards to the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan.			
5318	First of all, we wanted to applaud your efforts to establish intertial reserves on the Olympic Coast, and also for your recommendations of a wilderness study for the Ozette Lake area			
5319	We strongly urge you to expand the park boundaries in the areas of Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, and the Hoh, Quinault, and Queets watersheds. This will go a long ways in protecting highly critical habitat areas for salmon and various species of wildlife. Alternative B addresses these concerns very well.			
5320	We would like to see the park service establish river protection zones to ensure salmon habitats and normal river flow, also something addressed in alternative B. We further urge you to recommend all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild Scenic river designations, and to recommend restoration of extirpated species such as the wolf.			
5321	Drawing from recommendations on alternative A, we ask that developed areas be restricted to their current size to avoid encroaching on surrounding ecosystems. It is preferrable to allow any new recreational development areas outside of the national park.			
5322	Finally, we strongly urge you to defer all decisions relating to wilderness areas until a comprehensibve wilderness management plan is compiled and available for public scrutiny.			
5323	We thank you for your attention to this matter.			
5324	Alternative D is not the best plan to protect the sensitive ecosystems in this area. The plan allows for more development, expanded campgrounds, roads, and other allowances for human usage that is not in the best interests of the sensitive ecosytems of this area.			
5325	188262		None Provided	N/A
5326	On careful consideration, we find the preferred General Management Plan alternative (D) for the Olympic National Parks to be inadequate. The document gives strong preference to motorized use and development, while coming up short on a plan to preserve the ecological integrity of Olympic National Park. The preferred alternative does not adequately address the need for ecosystem restoration. Such a plan will also greatly compromise the ecological integrity of the wilderness area. Ecological protection should be the overriding factor in any plan to manage the Olympic National Parks. These vital ecosystems must be protected because they are vital ecosystems. It should not be about opening the area up to further motorized use and development.			
5327	189438		Sequim	WA
5328	I've reviewed selected portions of the draft in the local library and			
5329	attended the open house in Sequim August 21, 2006.			
5330				
5331	I support the Preferred Alternative ("D"). I believe it is an excellent			
5332	compromise which provides the public access which I believe is necessary			
5333	for sustaining adequate public appreciation of the unique value of the			
5334	natural wonders of this area.			
5335	Without broad public recognition of these values, I believe our			
5336	government will increasingly let them be eroded by commercial interests.			
5337	I think the preferred alternative amply serves the conservation			
5338	interests for the duration of the Plan and provides that necessary level			
5339	of public access.			
5340	Well Done.			
5341				
5342	I do offer one suggestion: I believe the final Plan should more			
5343	explicitly commit to evaluating the feasibility of a bus-type			
5344	shuttle-service between the Park Headquarters Visitor Station in Por			
5345	Angeles and the Hurricane Ridge Visitor Station. A substantial			
5346	reduction in the hundreds of automobiles traveling this road would be of			
5347	significant ecological benefit and would, I believe, actually enrich the			
5348	visitors' experience. A frequent shuttle which made provisions for			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5349	stops at the Switchback Trail Trailhead and even one or two of the			
5350	overlook pullouts should provide great incentive for people to leave			
5351	their cars at the foot of the mountain. I realize such shuttles are			
5352	themselves costly and the seasonal variance in Park use poses problems,			
5353	but certainly this consideration should receive a thorough evaluation.			
5354	The Plan should at least call for such an evaluation, not merely allow			
5355	for it.			
5356	190945		Port Townsend	WA
5357	Regarding the alternatives (A through D) presented in the Draft GMP/EIS (May 2006) for Olympic National Park, my preferences are: Headquarters: A, Hurricane Ridge: B, Elwha: D, Lake Crescent: B, Sol Duc: B, Ozette: B, Mora: B, Hoh: B, Kalaloch: B, Queets: B, Quinalt: A, Staircase: A, Dosewallips: D, Deer Park: D, Wilderness: B.			
5358	As the population grows, development pressure (power boats on Lake Crescent, snowmobiles in Yellowstone, ORVs in national forests, etc.) on wilderness areas increases. The primary goal of national parks should be to preserve the wildlife and wilderness experience instead of "accommodating a wide variety of uses, including stock use and universally accessible trails" as proposed in alternatives C and D (Draft GMP, pg 85).			
5359	Ideally the GMP should acquire additional land to protect watershed, wildlife, etc. while maintaining (or slightly reducing) existing campgrounds, roads, etc. Alternative D would be enhanced if land acquisition was included, and alternative B would be improved by not closing so many existing campgrounds. RSVP so I know you have received this note.			
5360	191240		Port Angeles	WA
5361	I wish to comment on the ONP Draft General Management Plan.			
5362	I support Alternative B - Resource Protection Emphasis.			
5363	The Park is almost intact, functioning ecosystem of the European pre-settlement era. This heritage that we are fortunate to have must be first-and-foremost protected and passed on to future generations.			
5364	I cannot support the incremental incursion of development as proposed in Alternatives C, A and D.			
5365	I fully support further park boundary expansion to better protect this unique eco-system. Protection of critical habitats as proposed into the various watersheds in Alternative B is essential.			
5366	Clean water will continue to grow as an area of concern. Please protect the watersheds.			
5367	Maintaining or reducing current recreational development, such as campgrounds, within Park boundaries will greatly assist privately owned campgrounds in the vicinity. This will improve the local economy more.			
5368	Increasing traffic will always be an issue. Consider mass transit as a means to resolve this rather than road widening - or more roads. This already successfully occurs at Hurricane Ridge during the winter.			
5369	I commend the park for recommending a wilderness study at Lake Ozette.			
5370	I live near Deer Park Rd. and am a frequent visitor to the Deer Park meadows area. Thank you for continuing to keep this a primitive, low use zone accessed by an unpaved road as outlined in Alternatives B, A, and D (preferred).			
5371	I strongly urge you to restore the extirpated species such as the wolf and fisher back to the Park. As already been demonstrated in Yellowstone Nat'l Park this also enhances the economic values to tourism.			
5372	Finally, I thank you for the wonderful 400 page Draft GMP/EIS handed out at the Port Angeles Open House Meeting. The Park Service employees were very friendly, open and informative. The visual displays of the various alternatives are great!			
5373	190982		Seattle	WA
5374				
5375	I write on my own behalf to give qualified support to a scaled back Alternative D, the preferred General Management Plan. However, I have concerns about the content and scope of the EIS and specific information apparently supporting Alternative D. It is my understanding that the selected alternative will guide, with some specificity, the planning, development, capital expenditures and maintenance costs of the Park for several decades. I question whether certain development and/or visitor friendly improvements are desirable and in the best interests of the Park, and intended user groups, given its unique nature and Wilderness designation. It truly is one of the last best places, and only stands to be degraded by too many user-friendly improvements.			
5376	Congratulations to the Park staff for their diligence in preparing such a comprehensive document the first in over thirty years which sets the tone for Park preservation and development, recognizing its importance as a unique and valuable resource in an ever shrinking world of wild places.			

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
5377	"Build it (or improve it) and they will come." This phrase illustrates the tension which National Parks endure as our federal government attempts to preserve those very special places for the present and future generations. A growing population, publicity about unique Park attributes and the lure of economic development in surrounding communities which capitalize on Park assets are a sure fire recipe to increase visitors and accelerate the degradation of the Park experience for many users. The prime virtue of Olympic National Park (ONP) is its innate wilderness characteristic, overlaid with vestiges of human presence up to the time of Park and Wilderness designation through acts of Congress.				
5378	Comments regarding specific measures in the Plan follow:				
5379	1. The GMP is in many respects too "general" to be useful. It is short on objectives, tasks, time-frames and budget needs to accomplish the generally identified subject areas.				
5380	Concern: Without more detail it is questionable whether Alternative D can be effectively implemented as a policy document. It leaves too much flexibility in interpreting and implementing Alternative D, to include expansion beyond the scale of items listed. Greater specificity in objectives and more detail in tasks will insure that the integrity of the agreed alternative will be followed in the long term, rather than left open to arbitrary interpretation of future park managers when implementing specific projects.				
5381	Recommendation: Add specific goals, objectives and related tasks, including details of budgetary requirements to meet them. This has been done in other National Park General Management Plans. Include numbers of new campsites and improvements at identified locations, maximum structure sizes for interpretive centers, and limiting language which will ensure that no greater development is permitted than what is included in the agreed Plan.				
5382	2. Assumptions regarding increased visitor use could be better documented and analyzed.				
5383	Concern: The Historical and Projected Visitor Use Chart, Figure 5, at page 173, assumes a single linear regression regarding use patterns from 1990 thru 2005, with a projection through 2009 based on the linear regression for this time period. The data actually shows a significant reduction in visitor use for 2003 and 2004, to levels recorded in the early 1990's. No data is shown for 2005. The time series data may not be linear and upward trending at all, and it is possible that visitor use may be even on the down turn given the Park's relative remoteness and the reliance on out of area visitors in automobiles to travel to the Park. It is also hard to reconcile a projection only thru 2009 when this planning document is contemplated to serve a time-period of between 15 to 20 years.				
5384	Second, ONP use is highly dependent on the seasonal weather especially huge amounts of rain, and snow in the high country, as well as road and trail access throughout the Park. These constraints define the use season in many areas and for certain user types. Even year to year, use seems to vary depending on the weather, sometimes including the summer months. This should be discussed more fully as regards utilization of each of the Park resource management areas. The seasonal visitor use data show very significant changes in Park utilization from summer to winter. Should campgrounds or expanded visitor facilities be constructed just for a one to two month high use season (July August) in certain resource management areas?				
5385	Third, there is no discussion or distinction regarding Park use by local populations as compared to destination visitors (from distances greater than ½ travel day). This could have a significant effect on the need for expanded campgrounds and other overnight facilities in the park or outside. The only way to reach the Olympic Peninsula is by car (or bus). If the cost of gas continues to rise over the long term, as expected, it may be that destination travelers will diminish over time, and thus the need for campgrounds in the Park will remain static. The outcome of a more careful and thorough analysis of visitor use, utilization of existing facilities should reach conclusions regarding visitor use and how that might affect facilities requirements. (For example, how often are the various individual campgrounds full on a seasonal basis, or how difficult is it to get a back country permit for specific locations during high use periods?)				
5386	With respect to data contained in several charts and narrative how does one "visit Lake Crescent?" the lake for its entire length is flanked on the south by the only major roadway (US 101) from Port Angeles to Forks, and used by all kinds of vehicles, which may have no relationship to Park visits. Additionally, cabins and full time residences apparently achieve "visit" status for each day occupied. I may be incorrect on these presumptions, but visit classification needs further clarification.				
5387	Recommendation: Further trend analysis on Visitor Use, historical and projected, is required, especially revisiting the regression analysis and near term trends, and a longer planning period (2020?). Perhaps a high and low range projection is in order. Further analysis and discussion of day and overnight users is required to determine need for expanded facilities in the near and long term. Consider whether capital expenditures for campground and interpretive centers are justified for the short use season.				
5388	3. What is the social carrying capacity of certain areas of the Park and what must be done to enhance or maintain the "wilderness" Park experience?				
5389	Concern: The EIS avoids (purposely) any quantitative discussion of "carrying capacity," or "user capacity" a method of attempting to quantify or qualify the impacts of overuse of a resource. In the context of the "wilderness character" of the Park, there should be detailed discussion of the effects of overcrowding by visitors and the effects on the wilderness experience.				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5390	Recommendation: I strongly opposed any development in the Ozette area including the Cape Alava and Sand Point trails. This area, it seems, already exceeds a subjective "user capacity" for a wilderness during high use periods. Perhaps a quota even for day use- should be considered. Minimal road access should occur on the roads in the Quinault and Queets drainages leaving these areas accessible to those who really want a wilderness experience which is buffered by several miles of gravel roads. Only provide minimal facilities and services at campgrounds. Class A motor homes and trailers should remain on paved roads only.			
5391	4. Discussion of Park impact on fisheries habitat is deficient			
5392	Concern: The Park is at the headwaters of 13 major drainages, many if not all of which, are significant habitat for anadromous fish (those that spend part of their life cycle in saltwater and return to fresh water spawning grounds to reproduce). Many access roads within the park utilize roadbeds constructed, very near to the streambed many years ago. Just what adverse impacts to habitat have occurred from the presence of these roads, and their recurring washouts and routine maintenance activities? What activities to improve or restore habitat can occur under the various alternatives and are consistent with park policy for fish habitat improvement. What will be done to coordinate activities with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and USFWS to encourage habitat improvement, even if it requires changes and improvement to fisheries habitat that deviates from natural conditions found in the Park.			
5393	Recommendation: Examine in more detail the effects of the long term presence of access roads on fisheries habitat. Maximize any opportunities to enhance and improve fisheries habitat as mitigation measures for past abuses of habit due to the presence of these man-made features in the Park to the fullest extent permitted by law.			
5394	5. State a Wireless communication policy, including facilities including such as cell phone towers, etc.			
5395	Concern: Like them or not, wireless communications have become a technological advancement which is pervasive, practical, growing in popularity, and not without positive and negative impacts for visitors and park administration in both the front country and back country (especially rescues). In many areas wireless service is not currently present, except to the extent certain carriers use facilities outside the Park. At the same time is it appropriate technology which should exist in a "wilderness character" National Park? It is not apparent that this topic has been discussed with respect to any of the alternatives.			
5396	Recommendation: Discuss wireless communications including cell phone tower prohibitions, or in the alternative locations, impacts and mitigation measures.			
5397	6. Policy on campground segregation of Tents and RV/Trailers			
5398	Concern: Tent campers and RV/Trailer occupants often have different expectations and requirements at campgrounds. Some RV/Trailers are equipped with generators to power certain appliances and conveniences like microwaves and televisions/video monitors. Generators are noisy and the operators/occupants of these "powered" campsites are often indifferent about their impact on other campers. Additionally, specifically at coastal campgrounds, including Klaloch, they tend to regularly dominate the view sites in campgrounds blocking Pacific Ocean views for all other campers.			
5399	Recommendation: Query whether these convenience appliances are appropriate for ONP campgrounds. Establish and strictly enforce rules regarding use of generators, including minimal hours of operation (better yet, prohibit them). Segregate RV's and trailers with their own areas, especially at the beach campgrounds where their vehicles and noise do not dominate the camping experience. Do not allow RV's and trailers to "hog" the views at Kalaloch and the other beach campgrounds and ruin the experience for all campers. Consider charging these campers more for campground use if generators or idling vehicles are allowed to power extraneous camper conveniences.			
5400	7. Discuss and make recommendations for Law Enforcement needs.			
5401	Concern: Alternative D includes certain expanded development including increases in camping and visitor use. Additionally, the communities adjacent to the Park are anticipated to grow over the planning period. It is recognized that the remote nature of the Park, its proximity to other wild lands, especially on the West end and the South end tend to encourage acts of theft and vandalism to campers.			
5402	Recommendation: Include specific GMP recommendations which include priority budgeting to increase law enforcement and technology (possibly tree mounted cameras in parking areas) which are necessary infrastructure for increased park development and use in the Front Country and at Back Country trailheads.			
5403	8. Give preference to local vendors to provide goods and services to Park users.			
5404	Concern: It seems that many National Parks utilize national corporations (e.g. Aramark) to provide goods and services to visitors. This does little for the local economies. Rather, low wage service jobs are provided to locals, while managers come from elsewhere and profits go to corporate coffers, rather than into the local economy.			
5405	Recommendation: To the extent permissible under federal contracting laws, provide opportunities to local vendors and employers, and state this clearly in the GMP and other supporting implementation documents.			
5406	Others have offered views on specific actions to be included in the GMP. We hope you consider other input about these as well.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5407	1. Reintroduction of Wolves - Please consider this only after careful study and consultation with governmental agencies and especially private landowners, and other out of Park user groups like hunters, who will be impacted by a reintroduction of the wolf. Adverse impacts to migratory elk and deer herds should be anticipated. Wolves do not understand the meaning of geopolitical boundaries of humans. They will seasonally follow food sources, such that when migratory elk herds (a primary food source) that move outside park boundaries in fall and winter. They may impact domestic animals of all types outside Park boundaries. Introduction of wolf predators may also make wildlife (elk and deer) more wary and reduce the opportunities for visitors to see these prey animals.			
5408	2. Wild and Scenic River Designation - Wild or Scenic River designations are a two edged sword. On the one hand, such designation can and often does preserve the basic integrity of the ecosystem by placing restrictions on development. On the other hand, it can be the curse of a river, because it publicizes the resource and encourages more of the public especially from outside the local area to use and abuse it, degrading the experience for other user groups.			
5409	3. Preservation of Historic Structures. National Parks reflect our history, as well as display their natural features. ONP was a site for CCC constructions projects began in 1933 during the Great Depression a very difficult and defining time in our nation's history. As one of the few locations in Washington where the imprint of CCC projects remain, it seems that preserving structures constructed during this time is justified in the Back Country as well as Front Country. Some of these structures were built by the ancestors of residents of this area. National Park and Wilderness policy and case law seem to allow for maintaining and even improving some of these structures, especially where they pre-date creation of the Park (1938), or wilderness designation (1988), or are a vital piece of history unique to the Park. They should be maintained as historic structures, and due to the hostile weather and other environmental factors, they are entitled to high priority maintenance, in the near term before they degrade even further. Other historic structures like lookouts shelters, guard stations and the like measure the development of the Park and deserve review for possible preservation.			
5410	Recommendation: Modify the list of buildings in Appendix E the EIS to include for each structure the date of construction, purpose of structure and indicate whether it was built by the CCC or has other historic purpose. Also indicate any necessary historic documentation, maintenance or stabilization, and determine whether each structure should be included in the National Park Service HABS/HAER program. Perhaps a priority grade should be assigned to individuals structures. Stabilization of Back Country structures should use pre-cut and fabricated natural materials transported to the site using minimal impact means (helicopter drop or ground transport).			
5411	General Conclusion			
5412				
5413	The GMP and specifically Alternative D are far too vague for meaningful public review and comment. More needs to be done to detail proposed actions, including setting goals, objectives, tasks and budget and time-frames. These should again be subject to public review as part of the GMP, and not individual implementation plans. To do otherwise seems to defeat the intent of NEPA and the EIS process. It is like shooting at a moving and shape-shifting target. The GMP needs to address "user capacity" limits (even if just conceptually) in specifically geographic high impact areas, in order to retain the "wilderness character of the Park. Greater emphasis should be placed on the Park's important role to improve habitat for anadromous fish because of its strategic location at the head of so many river basins, and mitigation should be required to atone for past degradation of habitat by the placement and maintenance of access roads.			
5414	In closing, as an ONP user of front and back country for over the last thirty years, I remain very concerned that ONP will be burdened with the legacy of other improved, publicized and overused National Parks thus resulting in a degraded wilderness experience. In reserving ONP and making its affirmative Wilderness designation Congress did not intended this Park to fall into the category of "mountains with handrails," or a cheapened amusement park. The NPS Organic Act or any other federal legislation does not specifically require that ONP be significantly developed. Don't build or improve it too much and maybe users who do not want a "wilderness experience" won't come in such large numbers so soon to destroy it. Leave a lasting wilderness legacy and a quality experience for future generations, and those who prefer a more rustic and unrefined alternative. There surely is a role for such a Park in the National Park System let ONP serve as a stellar example.			
5415	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important planning document which will protect and guide Olympic National Park for the next two decades or more.			
5416	190546			
5417	I am writing as a private citizen, please disregard the company named on my email.		None Provided	N/A
5418	One reason that Olympic National Park is so unique is that there is so much truly wild and unspoiled space-- which protects and provides for such plant and animal diversity. This is possible at least in part because so much of the park is quite remote and hard to get into. Please keep it that way. If any developing (tourist centres, roads, whatever) is required please keep it outside the boundary.			
5419	188465		Forks	WA
5420	Wilderness values is used throughout the GMP however, there is not a definition/clarity of what the term means until page 189, which is not listed in the index. The section Wilderness Values Chapter 3, page 117, is a description of wilderness but not of values. that appear to be a driving factor in determining how the park will b emanaged. Those in the park service may use the term as jargon understood in a succinct (defined) manner; but to the lay person it is open to interpretation/debate. It woudl help if there was a reference to page 189 at the first use of the term.			
5421	Additionally, would I be correct in assuming that the only wilderness values defined for the OPN are those listed on pages 189-190?			
5422	Are there wilderness values separate from the wilderness resource values which are listed on pages 189-190?			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5423	If wilderness character can only be subjectively determined by the visitor's experience (as stated on p 190), how do you determine standards that do not change easily? (become so restrictive that few if any visitors can access pristine areas)			
5424	190548		Port Angeles	WA
5425	The 1938 enabling act that created Olympic National Park states that it is "dedicated and set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." This mandate should not be lost in the cloud of environmental technicalities.			
5426	There is a mandate to protect the natural environment: ecosystem, wildlife, fish, etc., and the 1988 Wilderness Act designated 95% of the 922,651 acres as wilderness. That leaves 46,132 acres as non-wilderness,			
5427	With these two concepts in mind I have the following comments:			
5428	1. I support Alternative C with the following modification. Other than some vague general language I was not convinced that the boundary adjustment of some 56,000 acres in the Lake Ozette area of land (much of which I understand to be productive DNR timberland) is justifiable or necessary. The vast reduction of harvestable timber on the Olympic Peninsula has already had a devastating effect on the local economy. However, ignoring the local economy, I don't find such broad statements as: "to carry out the park purpose, address operational and management issues, protect the park resources," convincing or justifying for the acquisition of such a vast amount of land. Additionally, we are constantly reminded that the park lacks sufficient financial resources to manage its present acreage. How can it financially manage an additional 56,000 acres?			
5429	2. Under Alternative C the Deer Park road would be paved and open year-round. Certainly eliminating some of the dangerous corners, widening the road in critical areas, and extending the season that the road is open are desirable. However, paving while it may be desirable, should only be considered if it can be justified economically when compared to maintaining a dirt road. The condition of the road and its closure for months has long been a local complaint.			
5430	3. Obstruction Point Road: I did not note any specific mention of this road's condition, but I think it desperately needs attention. While I recognize that there is an overriding management desire to maintain the environment and ecosystem in an undisturbed state, this is no justification to allow this road to remain in its present dangerous condition. There are several stretches on this busy road (I counted 59 vehicles at the trailhead on one Saturday several years ago) that are just waiting for a critical if not deadly accident to occur. The road should be improved and widened in these critical stretches.			
5431	4. Wilderness and trails: The 1988 Wilderness Act defines wilderness as "federal land retaining its primeval charter and influence without permanent improvement or human habitation." A trail passing through a wilderness is not a permanent improvement or human habitation. Alternative D proposes three wilderness zones: trail, primitive, and primeval and would reduce visitation in the trail and primitive zones "slightly" and increase it in the primeval. While Alternative C proposes more trails in the wilderness trail zone, I think it is a mistake to reduce trail access in the wilderness even "slightly" (whatever that means). While more trails in the wilderness trail zone might at first be interpreted as a reduction in wilderness experience, in reality it will increase the wilderness experience because more trails means less hikers on each trail. With increased visitors in the future, reducing or even maintaining the present number of trails will only crowd more people on existing trails, and diminish the wilderness experience. In the allocation of the three wilderness zones please remember the park was created for the "benefit and enjoyment of the people."			
5432				
5433	5. No new trails have been created in years. There are many areas in the so called wilderness trail zone that could be opened to allow visitors to enjoy a wilderness experience. The excuse is always there is no money to even adequately maintain existing trails, yet there seems to be money for other projects I know funds are earmarked or come by way of grants etc. If so why isn't more money allocated for trails? Since the park is supposed to be 95% wilderness, trails should be entitled to a high priority.			
5434	6. Mountain Goats are a stately attraction and add to the wilderness experience. Friends have shared majestic photos of them in the Olympics. The claim that they are not native, which may be incorrect, and they must be removed to protect some obscure indigenous plant is bogus. On balance the goats add far more to the wilderness experience and to the "benefit and enjoyment of the people" than an inconspicuous plant that may in time adapt to the goats. I have heard some very disturbing accounts of the cruel and inhumane treatments afforded the goats the last time the park engaged in its exodus operation.			
5435	190800		Port Angeles	WA
5436	Letter on File			
5437	190895		Sekiu	WA
5438	I and my wife live about 17 miles from Swan Bay and frequent the lake every so often, our kids, grandkids and friends love the area and spend much of the summer up there.			
5439	Regarding motor boats of a certain small size, we were just up at Swan Bay camping with our four grandchildren. Our son and daughter each had a boat with large motors and pulled the kis on inner tubes made for that, they also tried a wake board. While we were there probably 15 kayakers or canoeists launched and theirs was the only boat in the area with a large motor. There is no reason that all users can't "share" a lake of that size.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5440	Another time my son and brother rescued some kayakers and one canoeist and brought them from Erickson Bay on their big boats or they may still be up there floundering around, they said at the time they would never go on that lake again. Allowing small power boats isn't going to cut it, the white caps came up and when this happens it gets rough and choppy coming back that I personally will never do it again. This has happened to me twice now and I can guarantee it won't happen again, that lake gets too rough to quick to be caught out there unprepared. Prepared is allowing larger motors. It can be very dangerous and people have already drowned.			
5441	Occasionally we go over to Ericksons Bay or Allens Bay with the boat, grandkids and a picnic lunch, a small motor would take forever to get there, we are very cautious and never cause a wake for the non motorized craft, perhaps a few big tickets would stop the ones that do?			
5442	We were asked several times when we've camped at Swan Bay if we were the camp host, after finding out we weren't there was some disappointment but we reassured several persons that we would keep an eye on there vehicles, closing this to camping is a security issue, when the word gets out, vehicles and everything else will be vandalized, there were several vehicles of dubious nature that came in, saw us, and left.			
5443	There should also be a fee to get into the Park like there is in most other places, this money could be used for the area.			
5444	Also I can't believe you'd even consider closing the Kalaloch campground since its probably the most popular campground in the whole park. Then moving highway 101? What about the disabled? This is probably the only place in Washington state that you can see the ocean from a vehicle, watch other people get razor clams etc etc. The roads are open in other states why not this one?			
5445	I know its hard to please everyone and I don't envy your job but I feel that lake Ozette is large enough for all users.			
5446	190706		Seki	WA
5447				
5448	MT: Okay. First of all I would like to say that my husband and I camped up at Swan Bay last weekend for four days. We had our grandchildren with us and my daughter and her husband and three kids also camped there. While we were there people mistook us for camp host and said that they wished that they knew that there was someone there that would kind of watch their vehicles because people are not into leaving their vehicles anymore. And we were thanked by several people Sunday. We didn't leave until Monday, and some had to leave Sunday, that because we did keep an eye on their things and my husband did help them put their canoes in, kayaks, launch their boat whatever; my son came up and his wife and they pulled the kids around on inner tubes. There is no reason, canoes were launched, kayaks launched; there is no reason now that you can't camp at Swan Bay.			
5449	That lake is big enough for all of us. And you're going to find rowdies no matter where you go. All you have to do is look in Clallam Bay on the way out and see the swastikas painted all throughout town. There are always going to be rowdies. So it's important to keep Swan Bay open. I wouldn't leave my car there all night either without some sort of security there. And people don't know someone is going to be camping there. It should be enhanced not closed off. In fact it could use a couple more campsites. The campground up at Lake Ozette is probably close to half of it's potential. It's very, very poorly maintained. The last time that we were up there anyway. The Park headquarters aren't up there and it appears that you have access personnel up there and I don't know what they're doing. But what about disabled persons? I'm on disability and I'm a grandma and I'm content to sit in my RV at Swan Bay. It's shallow and the kids can play and have a great time. And you have to be able to enjoy this from a vehicle, not walking on trails in primitive areas. That's for the younger generation. A lot of this land was donated with good intentions that people in the future could enjoy it.			
5450	We've camped at Kalaloch Campground on Highway 101 as it is. It's probably the most popular campground in the Park system now. And it's silly to even think about closing it or moving it. Let's see here& It's the only section of the beach that you can drive along and you're considering rerouting it? I'm for more visitor opportunities, not less. And I do not like gray. I prefer black and white. This entire draft plan is gray. It says environmental impact statement. It's gray. It doesn't show it that I've seen. What does this thing cost you now? I'm not for relocating the lodge and the cabins and facilities or anything else at Kalaloch.			
5451	And to get back to motors on Lake Ozette, we've went up there about three years ago and we took a boat ride and we got this lake kicked up. I'm not for having a smaller motor. We may not have gotten back had we had a little tiny motor. And then when my kids were babies about forty years ago we went up there and it got so rough that my husband had to bring the boat back for this guy that owned the boat. Because we went over in one trip and we came back in three boat loads. You need the motors on there. My son and my brother rescued kayakers and canoers about three years ago also because it was so rough that they couldn't get back. And I know that you're supposed to be prepared to spend the night but how many of these kayakers really do? And then go home and go to work. Like I said, in closing, the lake is big enough for all of us not just special user groups.			
5452	Thank you for the opportunity. I know that it's hard to please everyone.			
5453	188263		None Provided	N/A
5454	I'm concerned about the apparent land exchange involved in the GMP. It was clear lands were added, but I was not sure what lands were being given in exchange.			
5455				
5456	190959	Washington Wilderness Coalition	Seattle	WA
5457	On behalf of our more than 10,000 members and supporters throughout Washington State, the Washington Wilderness Coalition (WWC) appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the Olympic National Park's Draft General Management Plan.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5458	Many of our members hike, camp, horseback ride, raft, climb, ski and view wildlife in Olympic National Park. WWC has worked in the past with citizen activists on the Olympic Peninsula to protect wild forest land and advocated for the park wilderness designations that occurred in 1998. WWC is a 501 (c)(3) non profit organization that has been dedicated to preserving Washington's unique natural heritage for over 25 years.			
5459	We appreciate the Park's extension of the comment deadline until September 30. This decision has allowed for citizens and organizations to develop more specific and useful comments on the lengthy document.			
5460	We support a number of positive recommendations in the preferred alternative (D) including:			
5461	" Establishment of Intertidal Reserves This designation would help address the increasing threats to the critical ecosystems between high and low tides on approximately 35% of the park's coastal portion.			
5462	" Park Boundary Expansions The nearly 16,000 acres of proposed boundary expansions would help protect key watersheds and critical wildlife habitat for at-risk species in the Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent and Queets area.			
5463	" Wilderness Suitability Study for Ozette Lake We support a wilderness suitability study for the currently non wilderness area around Ozette Lake. Pending the results of that analysis and further Congressional action, the area could be designated as wilderness.			
5464	" Proposed Wild & Scenic River designation for the Elwha River We support a Wild and Scenic River designation for the identified segments of the Elwha River.			
5465	We also have a number of specific recommendations about other aspects of the draft plan. Our concerns are as follows:			
5466	I. A Wilderness Management Plan for Olympic Park Wilderness Must be Completed			
5467	It has now been 18 years since the Olympic Park Wilderness was designated through the Washington Park Wilderness Act of 1988. In that time no wilderness management plan has been developed by the Park. Failure to complete a wilderness management plan is a violation of National Park Service policy.			
5468	According to National Park Service Management Policy, each park that contains designated wilderness is required to develop a wilderness management plan every 10 years:			
5469	"A wilderness management plan will be completed every ten years by all parks containing wilderness resources for the purpose of providing accountability, consistency, and continuity to the National Park Service's wilderness management program. The requirement to have a current wilderness management plan (or similar plan) applies to all areas containing suitable, study, proposed, recommended, and designated wilderness. (Section 6.3.1; Directors Order # 41)			
5470	The wilderness management plan is intended to deal with a variety of important issues including clearly identifying the boundaries of wilderness units of the park; reviewing the status of potential wilderness areas, analyzing specific management actions to be applied to govern public use and protection of the resource in wilderness areas.			
5471	NPS policy states that, "the park's wilderness management plan may be developed as a separate document or as an action component of another planning document." (Section 6.3.4.2) The draft general plan includes a number of wilderness related issues (i.e., proposed changes in existing wilderness boundaries, management restrictions on equestrian use) which indicates the Park has appropriately identified that these and other wilderness related issues are long overdue and need attention now. This argues for developing the content of a wilderness management plan as part of this planning process.			
5472	We believe a wilderness management plan for Olympic National Park should be developed as part of the current planning process and that development of the wilderness management plan should occur before proceeding to the development of the general plan.			
5473	The Park's current practice of deferring wilderness management issues until after the general management plan (which could be another 5+ years) is unacceptable and lacks justification particularly given the fact that 95% of the park is designated wilderness.			
5474	II. The Park Service Should Conduct a Full Analysis of all Eligible Rivers for Wild Scenic River Recommendations			
5475	Although the preferred alternative recommends two segments of the Elwha River for wild and scenic designation, it fails to analyze or make recommendations for 12 other rivers that have been determined to be eligible. These include the Bogachiel, Ozette, Calawah, Queets, Dosewallips, Quinault, Duckabush, Skokomish, Gray Wolf, Sol Duc and Hoh Rivers and Royal Creek.			
5476	Under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, all federal land management agencies, including the National Park Service, are required in their planning processes to study rivers for eligibility in the national system. According to Section 5(d)(1):			
5477	"In all planning for the use and development of water and related resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved in potential wild and scenic and recreational river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to Congress shall consider and discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigation to determine which additional wild, scenic and recreational river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports by all Federal agencies as potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved."			
5478	In addition, the National Park Service's own management polices state that, "potential national wild and scenic rivers will be considered in planning for the use and development of water and related land resources. The Service will complete a listing of all rivers and river segments in the national park system that it considers eligible for the national wild and scenic rivers system." (Section 2.3.1.10)			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5479	The Olympic National Forest, in its 1990 forest land and resource management plan, has also determined many of these rivers to be eligible as part of its own studies and analysis (including the Duckabush, Dosewallips, Gray Wolf, Elwha, Sol Duc, Bogachiel, Hoh, Quinault and South Fork Skokomish Rivers). However, since the majority of some of these rivers lies within Olympic National Park (i.e., Hoh, Quinault, Bogachiel, Elwha) the Forest Service has not performed any further analysis and is deferring to the Park Service for any recommendation to Congress to include these rivers in the national Wild and Scenic Rivers system.			
5480	Given that the Olympic National Park has not updated its management plan since 1976, and that the next plan revision is not likely for another 20 years, it is essential that these additional river segments be studied and recommended for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers system in this planning cycle. The combination of detailed eligibility studies conducted by the Forest Service and the Park's own preliminary analysis provide a solid basis upon which to make recommendations as part of this plan revision.			
5481	If the Park believes it needs to do further analysis or detailed eligibility studies before it can make recommendations to Congress, it is required to do so as part of this planning process, as noted above. Additionally, the fact that the Forest Service is deferring to the Park Service for any further studies and recommendations to Congress on Wild and Scenic Rivers adds even more urgency to addressing this issue during the current planning process.			
5482	III. The Plan Should Address the Status of Potential Wilderness Areas			
5483	In November 1988, Congress passed the Washington Park Wilderness Act of 1988 which designated significant acres of wilderness in Olympic National Park as well as about 378 acres of potential wilderness areas. Potential wilderness areas were parcels that possessed significant wilderness character and were intended by Congress to revert to a wilderness designation without further Congressional action after a particular action (usually an existing use or conflict) was taken.			
5484	The Park has an obligation to fulfill the clear intent of Congress and the draft management plan is an appropriate venue to, at a minimum, give a timely update on the status of those potential wilderness acres.			
5485	V. Include Pyramid Peak Ridge Wilderness Suitability Study in Preferred Alternative (D)			
5486	The Pyramid Peak Ridge area near Lake Crescent was recommended for a wilderness suitability study in Alternative B, but was not recommended for suitability in the preferred Alternative (D). There is little justification for excluding the wilderness suitability study in the preferred alternative. The Park has already indicated that this area has significant wilderness character to merit consideration for a study and it seems that doing that analysis is important.			
5487	VI. Remove Reference to Management of Equestrian Use in Wilderness			
5488	The following statement occurs in the margin of a chart on page 60 of the draft, "Note: Stock would generally be restricted from some trails and sites and from camping above 3,500' elevation. Some stock use might be restricted to protect native species" (Pg 60). There is no further discussion of this statement. It is not appropriate to indicate what appears to be a new policy governing specific use in wilderness without a careful and deliberate discussion and analysis of rationale. This discussion does not occur anywhere in the draft plan and, consequently, has the effect of raising concerns from equestrian and other user groups about the Park's intentions.			
5489	Currently there are stock camps and stock trails above 3,500 feet elevation in the park. If there is an interest in restricting current use for some reason, the Park should deal with that issue in more detail than simply through a single note in the general management plan. If not, the note should be deleted from the general management plan and revisited later.			
5490	VII. Plan Should Include Management Options to Restore Extirpated Species Including the Gray Wolf			
5491	Gray wolves once roamed the entire Olympic Peninsula until they were systematically hunted, poisoned and trapped into extinction by the 1930s. Since then reintroduction of wolves to Olympic National Park has been suggested at least four times, the most recent of which coming in 1999. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service conducted a feasibility study in 1999 which found that there was sufficient prey and habitat to support a population of some 50 or more wolves in the Olympics			
5492	The restoration and recovery of previously extirpated species such as the gray wolf should be a future desired condition of the general management plan. The National Park Service's own policies call for the active restoration of listed species:			
5493	"&the Service will& undertake active management programs to inventory, monitor, restore, and maintain listed species' habitats; control detrimental nonnative species; manage detrimental visitor access; and reestablish extirpated populations as necessary to maintain the species and the habitats upon which they depend." (Section 4.4.2.3)			
5494	The draft plan fails to address management options associated with the gray wolf. At a minimum, the gray wolf should be included in a future desired condition of the Park. We feel it is also appropriate for the Park to give guidance on how to move forward with restoring the wolf to the Park based on the policy statement noted above.			
5495	First hand experience with wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone National Park has taught us that restoring wolf populations to an ecosystem has a number of benefits. Wolves provide a population check on large ungulates such as deer, moose and elk and reduce artificially increased coyote populations that create an imbalance in smaller mammals, like marmots.			
5496	Wolf reintroduction has also been shown to provide positive economic benefits to the area. According to John Duffield, an economics professor at the University of Montana, reintroduced wolves in Yellowstone generate about \$70 million in regional benefits.			
5497	VIII. Hoh & Quinault Park Boundary Expansions Should Be Included in Preferred Alternative (D)			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/Provin
2	Correspondence			
5498	Proposed Boundary expansions in the Hoh and Quinault watersheds are proposed in Alternative B but not included in the preferred alternative (D). The plan fails to justify why these areas were not proposed for addition.			
5499	The plan points out that the Hoh corridor and Quinault parcel proposed for addition to the park in Alternative B would help protect a key flood plain and upland and, "would benefit fisheries in the Hoh River, including the threatened bull trout, and salmon, protecting the physical habitat conditions and water quality." (Pg 371) These parcels are also used by elk herds during the winter for thermal regulation and foraging.			
5500	IX. River Zone Protections Should Be Included in Preferred Alternative (D)			
5501	We are concerned that the preferred alternative does not include designated river protections zones as in Alternative B. The rivers and riparian areas in the Park provide some of the best remaining habitat for threatened and endangered salmon species. The river zone protections are the only measure in the plan that offers adequate protection for fish habitat and naturally sustainable river systems. These protections should be included in the preferred alternative.			
5502	In conclusion, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan and for the extended period in which to comment. While the draft plan puts forward a number of proposals to improve the ecological integrity and long term vision of Olympic National Park (i.e., boundary expansions, wilderness suitability studies), it does not go far enough. Of greatest concern, the draft plan ignores clear Congressional intent and guidance from Park Service policies in a number of cases. Specifically, the plan fails to fulfill the Park's obligation to complete a long overdue wilderness management plan and follow through with recommendations for all eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers and			
5503	Thanks in advance for your careful consideration of our comments and we look forward to working with you to improve the management of Olympic National Park.			
5504	188303		Port Angeles	WA
5505	"OLYM DRAFT GMP/EIS Chapter 2"			
5506				
5507	We favor ALTERNATIVE C.			
5508	Man has been excluded from OUR PARK enough.			
5509	A better alternative, not shown, would be to roll back policies to about 1955 and insert (if not there) a policy of aggressive fire fighting - we don't take much comfort in knowing that it will take more than 2 centuries for Yellowstone to return to it's former beauty.			
5510	190851		Port Angeles	WA
5511	Letter on file.			
5512	191201		Graham	WA
5513	Letter on File			
5514	190618		Tonopah	N/A
5515	Greetings. We are XXX from Casa Blanca			
5516	Hot Spring in Tonopah, Arizona. We travel the western part of the US and			
5517	Canada visiting and soaking in, by now, a couple of hundred hot springs			
5518	which we photograph and write up for various publications, including HOT			
5519	SPRINGS & HOT POOLS OF THE NORTHWEST, HOT POOLS & HOT POOLS OF THE			
5520	SOUTHWEST, "Naturally" magazine, and N magazine, the latter two of which are			
5521	Naturist publications.			
5522				
5523	Concerning Olympic Hot Springs in Olympic National Park, we are most			
5524	concerned and somewhat dismayed that three plans (B, C, & D) are being			
5525	considered to eliminate the soaking pools at Olympic Hot Springs, pools			
5526	which have been used for therapeutic and recreational soaking for thousands			
5527	of years. Please don't remove such a valuable resource that has been used			
5528	for so long. It would be a tremendous loss to the many people who soak at			
5529	Olympic.			
5530	Rather than totally removing the pools and creating a void where once			
5531	existed a wonderful natural experience, it would be better to reduce the			
5532	number of pools to increase water flow. Geothermal springs are a resource			
5533	which should be managed by your agency (the same way you manage the other			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5534	resources in the park) for all to enjoy, not to be removed at taxpayers'			
5535	expense. The naturists who use Olympic Hot Springs have shown over and over			
5536	that they keep areas cleaner than most user groups.			
5537	Again, we ask in emphatic terms, please do not consider removing the soaking			
5538	pools at Olympic Hot Springs. Thank you.			
5539	190555			
5540	These comments in reference to the General Management Plan are the opinions from the Port Angeles Regional Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors. This board represents 545 members on the Olympic Peninsula. We hope you find our observations helpful.	Port Angeles Regional Chamber of Commerce	Port Angeles	WA
5541	Headquarters, ONP Vist Ctr & Heart of Hills			
5542	-We would suggest you focus on Option D. We receive many requests for better public transportation to and within the park. This option seems to help in this area. However we suggest you not only keep Heart of the Hills Campground but expand it to make it more user friendly for larger RVs. and also offer RV hook ups with water and power. (No generator use & no longer than seven day stay)			
5543	Hurricane Ridge & Obstruction Point			
5544	-Option D appears to be the best choice here. Having Hurricane Ridge road open more often and more consistently would be a big plus to our business community. With that in mind we would like to see better snow removal for the ridge road. Also allow for upgrade of ski area facilities. Recommend putting ski area operations out to bid for a private developer and allow them to enlarge facility.			
5545	-We also encourage you to allow Hurricane Ridge Road to be used for Bicycle special events. This ride would be very popular as a hill climb, or part of an organized tour event. Putting a limit on the use to no more than three times per year would be acceptable.			
5546	Elwha			
5547	-This section is going to be going through major changes in the years to come, as the dams are removed. We like your approach to the growth with the comments in option D			
5548	Lake Crescent			
5549	-Improving the trail on the North shore of the lake would be great. We need to have another option for cyclists and get them off 101. Of the options we agree most with option D. However we do not agree with increasing the boundaries of the park.			
5550	Sol Duc			
5551	-The Sol Duc area is very popular and definitely would be used more if it were open for a longer season. Therefore we agree with option C			
5552	Ozette			
5553	-We agree with option D but only with these adjustments:			
5554	*improve Ozette Campground to handle larger RVs with power and water. (no generator use & no longer than a seven day stay)			
5555	*Allow nonmotorized and motorized boating. However, we suggest that no wake zones be established to help separate the users, which would allow for a better experience for all, and promote safety.			
5556	*Park boundaries stay at current levels			
5557	Mora			
5558	-We like Option C except we would like the Park to take it a step further. We encourage ONP to do a land swap to allow Quileute Tribe to have access to some higher land, and ONP have an official trailhead and defined access to second beach. This would make a much better trailhead and also allow the tribe to have a safe haven during severe storms.			
5559	Hoh			
5560	-We agree with the ideas proposed in option D			
5561	Kalaloch			
5562	-This area definitely needs upgrading. It has much more potential if the facilities were improved. Therefore we agree with option D			
5563	Queets			
5564	-We would like the Park to pursue option C			
5565	Quinault			
5566	-The improved trail and biking opportunities in C would be very welcome. This option would increase the visitor access and make the area more of a destination. We encourage option C.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/Provin
2	Correspondence			
5567	Staircase			
5568	-Agree with option D			
5569	Dosewallips			
5570	-Agree with option D			
5571	Deer Park			
5572	-The Deer Park area in Park history was a much higher use than now. We would like to see this area grow and we feel the options of C would allow this to happen best.			
5573	Wilderness			
5574	-Olympic National Park is known for the wilderness areas that are so prevalent. Keeping wilderness as a big part of the Park experience is important to us all. Therefore we agree with option D except no boundary adjustment.			
5575	190918		Carlsborg	WA
5576	Letter on File.			
5577	190720		Port Angeles	WA
5578	RE: Some comments on the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan/EIS			
5579	My husband and I hike, whitewater kayak, ski, and backpack in the Park. We recreate in the Park at least every week, year 'round. We are Park volunteers, and take responsibility for the maintenance of the West Lake Mills Trail.			
5580	We appreciate that managing the Park is a difficult balancing act. Especially in our current times, we feel the balance must generally be tipped in the rare direction of resource protection. I have read the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, and would like to submit the following general comments&.			
5581	We love the Park as it is, and would be satisfied to see its current management continued. In my opinion, however, you have suggested some good opportunities for expanding the Park, and improved management in both your Alternative "B" and "D." Your "Alternative C" is downright scary, is counter to the ageless ideals of the Olympic National Park, and should be eliminated from this discussion altogether.			
5582	Following is a potpourri of my thoughts:			
5583	Lake Crescent: I am concerned about the level of development on Lake Crescent. In just the last few years, there are new homes, new docks, more motorboats, a large new OPI building, etc&at this rate, peaceful Lake Crescent is sadly becoming the overdeveloped Lake Sutherland! Our drinking water comes from Lake Crescent, so we are also concerned about water quality with this increasing lake use. Please continue the ban on Jet Skis, and consider a ban on all motorized boats as well.			
5584	I applaud the proposal, as in Alternative "B" to broadly expand the National Park boundary near Lake Crescent, and also to buy out private property parcels as they become available for purchase. It's too bad the lands within the proposed boundary adjustments have been recently logged&.but it still makes good sense to protect the land from this point on.			
5585	Road access: Your preferred Alternative "D" strikes a reasonable balance regarding year-round road access to the Hoh, North Fork Quinault, Graves Creek, Queets, Olympic Hot Springs Road, etc. While a part of me knows that turning these roads into trails would be the honorable thing to do, losing the year-round access would be a tough adjustment for those of us who frequent the Park during wintertime.			
5586	Elwha restoration: I know this isn't addressed in the Draft Management Plan. However, as past present of the Olympic Rivers Council, our organization worked hard to help make the Elwha Restoration Act happen. That was in 1992, and we still have nothing to show for the Act. At this pace, I may not live to see a more restored, free-flowing Elwha and I'm not that old! In addition to a more productive pace, I'd like to see the northern Park boundary expanded to include the lower Elwha River valley.			
5587	Horse usage: I'm glad to see that stock use in the Park, under the Preferred Alternative "D" would be reduced.			
5588	Boundary adjustments: Go for it! The more Park, the better!			
5589	I just returned from a backpack in the Park. I remember standing above Cameron Pass and seeing undisturbed wilderness for miles in all directions what a great feeling! I felt relieved&for all the critters, for me, and for the sake of the earth&that the Park is and will continue to be preserved. Please keep the Park as undeveloped as possible, and don't bend to the pressures to commercialize the Park experience.			
5590	Good decision making to you.			
5591	190979	(none)	Arlington	VA
5592	Most or all of the Olympic NP General Management Plan proposed alternatives (except perhaps the "no action" alternative A) contemplate "restoration" of Olympic Hot Springs by removing all "human-constructed" modifications to the springs. Removing those modifications (which are unobtrusive and do not interfere with the natural ambience of the springs area) would effectively destroy the springs, by preventing the hot water emerging from the springs from collecting in pools large and deep enough for park users to soak in. Such destruction of the springs should not be part of whatever park management plan is adopted.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5593	I went to Olympic Hot Springs in 1996, on my second and most recent visit to the park (living on the East Coast, I don't get out to the Pacific Northwest too often, but do plan to get out there next year). I found it much nicer and more natural than the heavily-developed Sol Duc facility. It was a good place to socialize with other park users, and discuss hiking and recreational opportunities in the park, while soaking away my aches and pains in natural hot water. Of the five dozen hot springs in North America I've been to, Olympic Hot Springs was among the best, and if they survive, would be the main reason for me to include a re-visit to Olympic NP in my next trip to the Pacific Northwest.			
5594	I understand there are sanitation problems, with hot water flowing into many pools, not all of which receive enough flow to prevent unhealthy accumulations of bacteria. But that is no reason to destroy all the pools. Concentrating the springs' outflow into fewer pools, as recommended by the Naturist Action Committee, would give the remaining pools enough flow to prevent unhealthy bacterial levels, while preserving the springs as a lightly-developed place for park users to soak in natural hot water. (Other proposals by NAC, including contracting out maintenance to an experienced caretaker as has been done with other hot springs on Federal lands, may also be helpful.)			
5595	In short, the management plans for Olympic National Park should preserve Olympic Hot Springs as a backcountry place for park users to soak in hot water, rather than destroy that recreational opportunity in the name of "restoring" the springs.			
5596	190552		None Provided	N/A
5597	As a Back Country Horseman, I am pleased to offer my comments to the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan.			
5598	1. The Plan mentions "Historic trails" and under "cultural resources" mentions that many trails were built in 1911, and that more were added in the 1930's by the CCC, but fails to mention that most were constructed with the help of pack stock. This important historical background gives foundation to our belief that these trails are our heritage, and must be available for us to enjoy with riding and pack stock.			
5599	2. I favor Alternative D (Preferred) with some reservations and comments:			
5600	a. "Wilderness opportunities would have slightly more focus on trail-less areas and would have slightly less stock use opportunity" any closure of trails to stock use should be in consultation with users. Designation of "primitive trails" must be restricted to high elevations where the steep terrain prevents stock use anyway. Expert stock users may find some of those steep trails preferable.			
5601	b. Trailhead parking needs to be improved in some areas. "Access& would be maintained by allowing the existing access route to remain open to vehicular use" but stock users may find insufficient parking space at several trailheads.			
5602	c. I enthusiastically endorse NPS plans to improve trailhead access to rivers that often destroy roads and bridges during flooding, especially the Queets and Quinault rivers.			
5603	I look forward to NPS development of its Wilderness Plan, which must include details or standards of trail size. Failure to maintain trails wide enough and tall enough for pack stock would effectively close them to such use, which must not be allowed to happen.			
5604	I am also concerned about NPS' plans to require certified weed-free feed at trailheads and on trails. While we all agree in principle that invasive weeds must not be allowed to proliferate in the Park, the enforcement methodology could present a serious issue to access if not developed in coordination with users. I recommend a dialogue with officials of the Back Country Horsemen of Washington (BCHW) for this purpose.			
5605	190622		None Provided	N/A
5606	Hello, I am a user of the hot springs in Oly National Park, I purchase a pass so I can visit other sections of the park thru the year. I am Peter Walsh of Tacoma, Wa. I am an active Naturist and member of 3 nudist organizations, TNS, ANNR and SLUGS. In fact a spent a lovely day camping at the Hoh Rain forest camp grounds this past week right beside the river...most enjoyable. The rangers were most helpful also.			
5607	I support the following changes and/or modifications to the NPS plan.			
5608	1. Retain soaking at Olympic Hot Springs, but reduce the number of pools at the Springs site to three or four, located near the main source. This will improve cleanliness by offering less restriction to flow. It will			
5609	help rehabilitate the runoff area, reduce the impact of use and enhance the integrity of the environment.			
5610	2. Contract the maintenance of the resource to an experienced caretaker. This approach has been implemented with great success by other agencies responsible for managing hot spring resources in the Pacific Northwest.			
5611	3. Convert the road (Olympic Hot Springs Road) to a trail beyond the Altair site. This is similar to an item proposed in Alternative B of the draft of the General Management Plan.			
5612	4. Maybe install a gate that would require a fee that could be used to cover some of the cost to maintain the area mentioned in the above.			
5613	I consider myself and others that partake in the nude use of the natural wonders of the USA as good stewards of the land and resources...carry in carry out... be aware of wildlife and flora protection, stay on the path and no pets etc.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5614	I think that the rehabilitation of the hot springs does not need to include destruction of a fine out of the way facility just to clean it up so to speak...moderation in all things makes things much better!!!			
5615	PLEASE RETAIN OLY HOT SPRINGS!!! Thank you and warm regards!			
5616	190928		Santa Fe	NM
5617	The Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan is bias and innacurate in that it continues to ignore it's reponsibilities for protection wilderness resources and continuously attempts to assert that cultural resources are, somehow, more important than wilderness resources.			
5618	The statement "Benign neglect would not be considered an appropriate management strategy. No national register-listed or eligible structure would be removed or allowed to decay naturally without prior review by park and regional cultural resource specialist" is absurd and ignores both the requirements of the Wilderness Act and NPS management policies.			
5619	These statements are nothing more than the parks continued attempts to insert the bias of the park's cultural resource staff and demonstrates a continued ignorance, and arrogance, towards wilderness.			
5620	The attempt to insert comments of this nature in the GMP are especially egregious since the park has continously neglected its responsibilities to ensure that wilderness is adequately protected through the completion of a comprehensive wilderness management plan (almost 20 years after wilderness was designated in the park) while it meanwhile attempts to foist bias, ill-advised, and illegal assertions within the GMP. These comments are nothing more than an attempt to circumvent past actions for which the park has been sued (and lost) due to the mismanagement of wilderness resouces.			
5621	The GMP suffers from a lack of input from qualified wilderness managers who might provide some balance to a document produced by persons who seemingly do not understand, or accept, the requirements of the Wilderness Act. It is little wonder that the staff at Olympic National Park has such a poor reputation within the environmental community and leaves them with little choice but to take legal action against this park for violating federal laws and generally failing to protect park resources.			
5622	I strongly suggest that all statements concerning historic and cultural resources in wilderness be deleted from the current document and substitute instead the statement:			
5623	"Historic and cultural resources within wilderness will be administered in keeping with the park's approved cultural resources management program and the additional requirements of the Wilderness Act. No significant management actions affecting cultural resources within wilderness, except those needed in emergency situations, will be conducted until the park has completed both the approved cultural resource plan and a comprehensive wilderness stewardship plan to ensure the proper coordination, consistency, and continuity of these two important programs."			
5624	190724		Seattle	WA
5625	I strongly recommend that you leave Rainier Landing available for overnite camping especially when the main campground is full. It's a long drive to the next available campground.			
5626	190810		Sammamis h	WA
5627	I understand logging, development, and illegal hunting constrict park boundaries, and many of the park's fish and wildlife species have become threatened over the past two decades. I expect you to make the wildlife that inhabits these areas your number one priority. While increased public opportunities to explore our wilderness is a good thing, having wilderness with a healthy, natural ecosystem is much more important. Please make restoring its threatened wildlife, and protecting its integrity as a world-class wilderness the number one priority when you develop this Management Plan. My kids are looking to you to have the leadership to make this happen.			
5628	189423		None Provided	N/A
5629	I was not able to attend the last mtng. but I would like to add my two cents.			
5630	We camped at July creek for many years and really miss being able to walk in to a campground with no RVs. Please do not forget that there are many of us that would still rather camp sleeping on the ground without cars coming and going and camper generators roaring.			
5631	Thanks for listening,			
5632	190700		Port Angeles	WA
5633	No change or new land needed. They (you) can't afford the what you have already.			
5634	190785		Kirkwood	MO
5635	These comments are on the draft general management plan for Olympic National Park. It is cause for rejoicing that the wild Olympic Range is still intact, while so much of the land around it was logged off. Here in Missouri we are conscious that one of the leaders in getting the national park established in 1938 was Irving Brant, an editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, who enlisted the help of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to overcome local opposition.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5636	I hope you will likewise overcome local opposition when you adopt a final plan. There is much to commend in the draft plan, but it falls short in several areas. The plan is good in establishing "intertidal reserves" along the ocean, and it wisely envisions optional public transportation at congested areas of the park such as the Hoh River and Hurricane Ridge.			
5637	Please abandon the expansion of the "development zones" in Alternative D. It would be a shame to install more commercial buildings and triple the size of auto campgrounds, especially in the Elwha and Sol Duc valleys, where people now find quiet places to fish, hike and have a picnic amid unspoiled nature. Private businesses should be developing all necessary tourist accommodations a few miles away, outside the park. Models for the "gateway" community exist around many other national parks.			
5638	The plan falls short in proposing additions to the park. Your "preferred" alternative D proposes minimalist additions that leave out much of the ecological units. Please include the additions indicated in Alternative B: the Ozette Lake watershed, the Crescent Lake trout spawning areas, the elk and salmon habitat zones on the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault Rivers. The total would be 87,000 acres.			
5639	The wild Olympic Range is a great national treasure that deserves the best protection we can give it. Thank you for considering my views.			
5640	P.S. On a personal note, my wife is from Tillamook Oregon. In 1964 she and I and our three kids followed the Oregon Trail west. Later a side trip to Hoh. What a spectacle for an oak hickory forest Missourian to see. Fallen giant conifers serving as mother trees for the next generation. An alpine meadow with magnificent flowers. To this day our two boys, now men, talk of the adventure; our daughter, married and with her own family now, lives in the Northwest. Thank you for protecting this national jewel.			
5641	189412		Redmond	WA
5642	many thanks for giving the opportunity for providing feedback on the plan.			
5643	As a not very frequent, but regular visitor of the park, I have following comments:			
5644				
5645	The Olympic National Park harbors a rich collection of wildlife and vegetation, which needs a natural environment free from artificial interruptions and influences, while allowing nonmotorized access by the public.			
5646	My vote is to choose the Alternative B - resource Protection, over all others, except where it affects camping facilities, where my preference is to maintain status quo, not expanding or reducing the current build-out. Non-motorized travel on the existing trails needs to be maintained.			
5647	Generally unacceptable is the expansion of roads and motorized traffic - these things belong in a national park only in the exception case.			
5648	I can see that the management preferred alternative in most cases is to increase visitor services. I do think this is a mistake, given the NPS's responsibility for maintaining the natural beauty and untouched character of the park.			
5649	I hope my voice can be heard in this sense,			
5650	191159	Portac, Inc	Beaver	WA
5651	Letter on File			
5652	190950		Port Angeles	WA
5653	Letter on File			
5654	191217		Seattle	WA
5655	I am against the proposed Draft General Management Plan, alternatives B, C, & D for the Lake Ozette area, for the reasons discussed below.			
5656	Adding thousands of acres of primarily clear-cut will improve no one's experience to Lake Ozette. It will just make money for the owners of the logging companies that sell nearly worthless clear-cut land, getting tax-payer's money.			
5657	The National Park Service sites potential logging that might harm the watershed. This land has almost all been logged already. Buying the clear cuts makes no sense. The National Park Service can't maintain what they already have.			
5658	Most of the Lake Ozette area has been homesteaded, lived on, logged, had roads built in it and even farmed. None of these areas can ever be a wilderness area, why spend tax payer's money on them for a wilderness area?			
5659	The proposed wilderness designation for Ozette will substantially restrict some uses of the lake and close the best boat ramp. Most visitors' experience will be degraded because they will be unable to use areas that they can use now.			
5660	It has been made clear to me, by my state representative, that only Congress has the ability to change NPS policy. Hence, my pleas for reasonable action have been forwarded to my national politicians, so they can stop the National Park Service's bad plans.			
5661	Please do not go forward with alternatives B, C, or D at Lake Ozette.			
5662	190933 - Link to Attachments	Washington Forest	None	N/A

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5663	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft General Management Plan for the Olympic National Park.	Protection Association	Provided	
5664	The Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA) is a private trade association representing many private forestland owners in Washington State. WFPA has worked collaboratively with federal, state and local governments, as well as tribes, environmental organizations and other forestland owners, over the last decade to ensure that forest practice activities conducted under the state forest practices rules meet the needs of wildlife, salmon and clean water.			
5665	In June 2006, the U.S. Departments of Interior and Commerce granted Incidental Take Permits to the state under the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan, recognizing that forest practices activities in Washington State meet the needs of the Endangered Species Act for aquatic species. Not only does this historic agreement have the approval of the Departments of Interior and Commerce, it also has the full support of the state's Congressional Delegation (see attachments) and a majority bi-partisan support of the state Legislature.			
5666	Therefore, we respectfully request the National Park Service, also a part of the Department of Interior (DOI), to reject your preferred alternative of expanding the park boundary to include private forestland, and instead analyze the alternative without including private forestland within the park boundary.			
5667	We also respectfully request that you either remove or modify references in the draft EIS to the following comments regarding logging:			
5668	Pages 202, 237, 276 and 313: "Logging operations near park boundaries create noise that detracts from natural soundscapes in the park." The level of sound and distance traveled would not cause noticeable detractions from natural soundscapes. Your document lacks the research and science to make this statement.			
5669	Pages 203, 239: "&unpaved roads outside the park (e.g., logging roads) near rivers and streams can result in increased erosion and sedimentation. These actions adversely affect the movement of water through floodplains and disrupt the natural processes of wetlands and riparian areas, causing long-term adverse impacts." Logging roads on private forestlands are managed under the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The HCP includes a program that requires a well-designed, located, constructed and maintained system of forest roads that protect streams and water quality. The HCP, through the state's forest practices rules, ensures that stream banks are protected from erosion, the amount of sediment entering streams is limited, fish passage to upstream habitat is ensured, construction of new roads is minimized, and thousands of miles of unnecessary roads will be removed or abandoned.			
5670	Private forest landowners are required to develop a Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan which inventories forest roads within their ownership, assess current road conditions and sets a timetable for necessary repairs or abandonment. Since 2000, more than 8,400 road plans have been completed, covering more than 58,000 miles of roads, and 775 miles of stream habitat has been re-opened by removing blockages to fish passage.			
5671	Pages 207, 243, 282, 319: "Logging activities, especially after the wide use of mechanical cutting methods, have had a major adverse effect on mature (old-growth) forests& These actions have had moderate to major adverse impacts on native vegetation communities in the region." There is no science in your document supporting this claim. All North westerners are aware of the spotted owl/old growth controversy of the late 1980's and early 1990's. The first campaign of President Bill Clinton hinged, in part, on his promise to strike a balance between citizens concerned about the environment and other citizens responsible for producing forest products used by all Americans.			
5672	The Northwest Forest Plan, developed by the Clinton Administration, made dramatic changes in Pacific Northwest national forest management. Harvest levels dropped by 80%. Approximately 80% of the 8.5 million acres of medium and late-successional conifer forests (older forests) managed under the Plan now are in land allocations that do not allow programmed timber harvests. [1] The plan does not save all older forest. Forest scientists who wrote the plan concluded some older forest could be harvested without significant harm to the environment.			
5673	Federal forestlands allocated to forest products production under the Plan are subject to stringent stream protection, wildlife and water quality protection requirements. Road design, construction and maintenance all are governed under strict standards; many old roads are being removed under the Plan's requirements.			
5674	Pages 209, 246, 283, 285, 320, 322: "On the Olympic Peninsula, habitat loss and disruption are the most common reasons for a terrestrial species to become threatened or endangered. Loss and fragmentation of habitat is occurring in the Olympic region as a result of logging, agriculture and urban development." This statement perpetuates the false impression that forest harvest as part of the managed forest landscape "fragments" habitat. A scientific conference held in 1999 addressed fragmentation in relationship to forest management and the consequences for wildlife populations in the forests of the western United States and Canada. It concluded that the negative effects of fragmentation on wildlife associated with forest land use changes in Midwestern and eastern parts of North America are not apparent in western forests managed for timber production, where older and younger forests are juxtaposed on the landscape.[2] Private lands in the area under consideration for addition to the Park have been in forest management for more than 100 years.			

		A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID		Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence				
5675	Wildlife assemblages and use patterns have certainly changed from pre-settlement conditions, but the current managed forest landscape supports a wide variety of habitats and species that is not expected to change as a result of continued sustainable forest management. In fact, habitat complexity is increasing on lands managed under the Washington State Forest Practices HCP as a result of forest practices rules in place since 1976 and the more recent additions to those rules. The recent Forests and Fish state rules more than triple the amount of riparian area and other set asides[3] to more than 20% of the landscape in areas with a high density of streams. 'Logging' must be removed from this statement.				
5676	Pages 212, 249, 288, 325: "Logging activities as well as the development and expansion of communities near the park have also disturbed archeological resources outside the park boundaries." This statement must be removed from your document. The Department of Interior's Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Forest Practices HCP, dated January 2006, Chapter 4.13, recognizes the extensive regulatory and voluntary practices private forestland owners operate under in order to protect archaeological, historic and cultural resources. The Washington State Forest Practices Regulatory Program regulates forest practices in the state including forest practices affecting archaeological, historical, and cultural resources on both private and State land. In addition to the regulations, the Cultural Resource Protection and Management Plan, written and agreed to by Timber, Fish & Wildlife participants on July 3, 2003, provide a process to enhance protection of cultural and archaeological sites on managed forestlands.				
5677	The basic functions of the plan involve largely voluntary actions designed to: foster improved communication and mutual respect between the State, Tribes, and landowners; provide cooperative processes to protect and manage cultural resources; and provide educational opportunities to foster trust, commitment, and understanding. Memoranda of Understanding, signed documents that describe the verbal agreements between landowners and Tribes, are cited in the Plan as the preferred pathway to protect cultural resources.				
5678	Pages 240, 279, 315: "&the expansion of the park boundary in the Lake Ozette area of the park would result in the restoration and protection of watersheds that flow into the ocean. Reducing the number of existing and maintained roads, and protecting the area from logging, would likely result in decreased sedimentation at the mouth of the Ozette River." These statements are particularly egregious and must be removed. The state requires that private forestland owners upgrade all forest roads to current state standards by 2016, or sooner if the road is used for hauling of forest products. However, the Park cannot currently meet its facility and road maintenance obligations and has a backlog of \$43 million, over 10 times the annual maintenance appropriations. Furthermore, the Park has no obligation to complete its backlog of maintenance projects, unlike the Forest Practices Act requiring state and private landowners to complete road maintenance by 2016.				
5679	The state rules and timelines will result in better road maintenance by private forestland owners than the National Park Service given your current maintenance backlog. As noted earlier, logging roads on private forestlands are managed under the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan which was approved by your own agency. The HCP includes a program that requires a well-designed, located, constructed and maintained system of forest roads that protect streams and water quality. The HCP, through the state's forest practices rules, ensures that stream banks are protected from erosion, the amount of sediment entering streams is limited, fish passage to upstream habitat is ensured, construction of new roads is minimized, and thousands of miles of unnecessary roads will be removed or abandoned. The HCP also includes protection measures that regulate the methods of harvest in these areas. The protection measures include limits on the felling and bucking of timber, and the use of ground-based equipment and cable yarding. Many of these measures are designed to minimize soil disturbance and reduce the potential for erosion and sedimentation.				
5680	Additionally, you reference the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan on page 182 of the Draft EIS, and refer to it as a draft plan. It has been finalized and approved as of June 2006. Your EIS should acknowledge the protections put in place on privately owned forestland for threatened and endangered species in the state of Washington.				
5681	Your document also states that "expansion of the park boundary at Ozette could open up privately owned lands to recreational use by park visitors." (page 263). Your document fails to recognize that private forestland owners do have recreational programs and they do open their lands to the public.				
5682	Your criteria for a boundary expansion (a determination that the alternate management and resource protection plans are inadequate) have not been met as it pertains to private forestland. Hundreds of people from state and federal agencies, tribes, scientists, small and large forest landowners and conservation groups have worked for thousands of hours over the last decade to develop cooperative plans to address the impacts of logging and road work on salmon habitat and water quality.				
5683	Your document fails to analyze the significant economic impact to individuals and the community of your "preferred alternative," which would remove 60,000 acres of productive forestland that currently provides a sustainable supply of logs to local mills, jobs, and income to the region. This would result in loss of family-wage jobs and displacement of works. The 60,000 acres produce approximately 60 million board feet of logs per year, sustainable forever. This volume is about one years supply for any of the modern mill facilities on the north Olympic Peninsula.				
5684	Your document grossly underestimates acquisition costs, by at least five times the estimate. Recent transactions of timberland property indicate prices of \$2500 per acre or higher, which translates into \$150,000,000 for 60,000 acres, or over five times the Park's estimate.				

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5685	If the Park pursues its proposed boundary expansion over private forestlands, it would impose further regulations on landowners. The Park claims that private land is purchased on a willing buyer/willing seller basis. However, the Park must first expand its boundaries by an Act of Congress to receive federal appropriations then, once the private lands are annexed and included within the Park boundary, an offer to purchase the land would be made. Your document fails to acknowledge that once private forestlands are included within the Park boundary, state rules require that any forest practice application submitted be treated as a Class IV-Special, making it much more cumbersome and costly to manage forestlands without additional environmental benefits. Management costs would likely further increase due to pressure from park advocates with interests in opposition to the forestry objectives of landowners.			
5686	The global market for wood products is very competitive and the Pacific Northwest is already a high-cost supplier of raw material. Cost increases exacerbate the competitive disadvantage and reduce the net value of these lands in the open forestland market place. Action to expand the Park boundary would amount to a de facto taking of private property as landowners find their property values artificially eroded and their positions in negotiations with the federal government distinctly disadvantaged.			
5687	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We are happy to work collaboratively with you to develop a preferred alternative that is mutually agreeable to all parties. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.			
5688	[1] Northwest Forest Plan, Record of Decision. April, 1994.			
5689	[2] Rochell, James A., Leslie A, Lehmann and Joe Wisniewski, editors. 1999. Forest Fragmentation. Brill Academic Publishers. Boston, Massachusetts.			
5690	[3] Rice, William, WA Department of Revenue. 2002. REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE Pursuant to Section 402, Chapter 4, Laws of 1999, 1st Special Session, Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2091			
5691	190527		None Provided	N/A
5692	Dear ONP Park Planners,			
5693	>As a frequent visitor to this precious National treasure here in the state			
5694	>I live in, I want you to know how much I appreciate its existence. You are			
5695	>being entrusted to make decisions that will have long term consequences for			
5696	>the people and animals alive now and those yet to come (or not). I hope			
5697	>that you appreciate the power that you have. I sense that alternative D is			
5698	>inadequate at preserving the ecological integrity of this unique spot on			
5699	>earth. Development, retaining man-made structures, and increasing			
5700	>motorized use does nothing to restore this ecosystem and maintain			
5701	>wilderness character that so many of us who put on a pack and walk under			
5702	>our own power are searching for in this over mechanical, concrete world.			
5703	>I do appreciate that intertidal reserves have been established on the			
5704	>Olympic coast and that Ozette Lake has been recommended for wilderness			
5705	>suitability. As in Plan B, I urge you to expand park boundaries around			
5706	>Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, and the Hoh(my favorite), Queets and Quinalt			
5707	>watersheds. Salmon and wildlife need as much space as you can give them.			
5708	>As a veterinarian, I work with pet dogs and cats, but often I think of the			
5709	>wild animals that I have been priveleged to observe about their ordinary			
5710	>lives in ONP--salmon spawning and dying in the Hoh river; black bears			
5711	>feasting on huckleberries around Hoh Lake, one playfully galloping across a			
5712	>sun-bleached log; elk walking ancient paths across High Divide; another			
5713	>black bear foraging the beach at low tide near Cape Alava...I could go on			
5714	>and on. Extirpated species, such as the wolf and fisher, need to be			
5715	>restored. To ensure their success, developed areas and development zones			
5716	>must be kept at their current size. Any new recreational developmentals			
5717	>need to be located outside of the national park. This will bring much			
5718	>needed income to those nearby communities who will always benefit from			
5719	>those who come to visit this unique world treasure.			
5720	>Finally, as plans for the removal of the dams of the Elwha are nearing an			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5721	>end, may you have the foresight to establish all 13 eligible rivers for			
5722	>federal Wild and Scenic river designation, ensuring critical salmon			
5723	>habitats and natural river processes are preserved. I ask for your			
5724	>diligence in protecting Olympic National Park's awe-inspiring beaches,			
5725	>forests, mountains, lakes, rivers, salmon, elk , bears and all those other			
5726	>creatures and plants that contribute to its irreplaceable nature.			
5727	190675	Backcountry Horsemen,	Yelm	WA
	I am a strong believer that horses should be allowed in the national forest and park as they presently are. This country and especially the west was settled by people who used the	Nisqualley Chapter		
5728	horse as a means of transportation and work animal.			
5729	To deny or take away the present trails would be like taking away the recreational boats off the water.			
5730	190935		Bellingham	WA
5731	Dear Management Team for Olympic National Park:			
	What a responsibility you have being stewards of this magical, wondrous park embracing the Pacific Ocean, the Olympic Mountains and the lush rainforests near Kalaloch.. How			
5732	lucky we are to have this splendid retreat and resource&to be preserved for all time for all peoples and the wildlife relying upon it for their very existence.			
5733	The balance between use and habitat preservation is always a challenge whatever level of park stewardship one follows.			
	I am on the Board of the Naturist Action Committee, and have a long history of enjoying Olympic Hotspots as nature intended from the time my skin was a smooth five year-old's to			
5734	its now cellulite-blessed sixty-three winters' ridges&My ancient bones love a good hotspots soak sans clothes!			
	Some of my earliest memories revolve around the Olympic Hotspots as a small child. We would always stop off and enjoy the main swimming pool while the resort buildings were			
5735	still there. Usually, we were on our way either to Neah Bay or to Kalaloch, another beautiful Olympic Peninsula destination for our family along with the rain forest along the Hoh River			
	While I can understand your frustration with the myriad pools and documented high fecal coliform bacterial counts, this could be easily remedied by reducing the number of pools at			
5736	the Springs site to three or four, in order to allow proper natural flushing. Sanitations is always a concern with any public water body, but particularly with hotspots.			
5737	Page 2- Letter: Public Feedback on Olympic National Park Management Plan and Defending of Clothing-Optional Usage of Olympic Hotspots			
	Also, you might try contracting the maintenance of these pools to a private contractor as was done for years at Meagher Creek Hotspots north of Vancouver, B.C., Canada, and at			
5738	other hotspots throughout the Pacific Northwest..			
	Sometimes, hotspots as with other natural amenities can fall prey to their own popularity. One way that you have mentioned in your Alternative B, would be to make the Olympic			
5739	Hotspots Road into a trail that would extend beyond the the Altair site. This would discourage the ATV's at least, or one would hope so, at least.			
	One should remember that naturist or clothing-optional usage of an area does not prevent textiles from enjoying a resource; only their own biases or hang-up's would do that. Thus,			
5740	would hope that traditional clothing-optional usage at the springs would be allowed to continue because naturists know how to live in harmony with the environment and with those natural places they cherish and protect. Bare feet and bare bottoms are far less intrusive than ATV's, broken beer bottles, and carload of partying yahoos.			
5741	Thanks for listening and please hold the entire park in gentle stewardship hands for it is not only a national . . . but an international treasure!			
5742	189370		Lynnwood	WA
5743	Additional text at beginning of form letter:			
5744				
5745	This park is a gem of the NW, and should be treated with all the			
5746	care and consideration you can. There are so few amazingly			
5747	beautiful place like this left in the world. You should be proud			
5748	of this wonderful park and protect it accordingly.			
5749	190674	Backcountry Horsemen	Yelm	WA
	Proposed Plan "D" comes closest to how I would like to see our park used. This country was settled on horseback and I want to be able to continue to ride in my park. The existing	of Washington		
5750	trails need to continue to be open to horses and mules. I would like to be able to provide input if changes are considered on any closure of access or use of the park concerns me. My husband, John, is a heart attack and stroke victim and he lives to ride in the quiet of the park. Thank you.			
5751	191036		Port Angeles	WA
5752	Olympic National Park is a congressionally designated wilderness reserve.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5753	My primary concerns is for development of a General Management Plan to protect this wilderness, prevents degradation of the habitat within it, and in some cases restores it on an ecosystem level. This in the face of continued development all around the park, and global climate changes that are already showing their effect on its hydrological systems.			
5754	This protection means that management of Olympic NP should:			
5755	-limit development to what is already there. This includes no more roads. This also includes maintaining existing trails within the park.			
5756	-actively seek to limit human-generated noise, primarily those from passenger jets flying in and out of the Seattle area.			
5757	- give greater protection to river and stream corridors within the park.			
5758	191041		Port Angeles	WA
5759	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on Olympic National Park's General Management Plan (GMP). These written comments are in addition to a brief email I sent earlier today.			
5760	I live in Port Angeles; Olympic National Park is in my backyard, almost. I have backpacked in the park for 26 years. The opportunities it has offered for quiet recreation and study have had a profound influence on my life. About 20 years ago, I discovered solo backpacking, and I have been doing more of that in the last 5-6 years. At the risk of sounding effusive and gauzy, Olympic's wilderness is a balm upon my soul.			
5761	This is why protection of Olympic's wilderness status is my overall main concern. 95% of this park is designated wilderness; the chief theme of the GMP must be protection of that wilderness. The following comments all stem from that central theme.			
5762	Development inside the park boundaries should be limited to current uses and should be properly maintained, but not expanded beyond what is already there. Visitor services should be located in the communities bordering the park if they are needed because of increased visitation. I am thinking here of RV parks, campgrounds, restaurants, and lodging. Development zones in the preferred alternative (D) are way too big, they made me think I was looking at alternative C again. Really I would recommend moving more of the natural resource protections from Alternative B to the preferred alternative.			
5763	Along the same lines of thought, there is much more emphasis on motorized access than there is on preservation, restoration, and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat and ecosystem function. There should be no new roads, just maintain the ones that are there now. Also, the plan should show a greater commitment to maintenance of existing trails. I thought the monies generated by the required wilderness pass would lead to better funding of trail crews, but I haven't observed much difference in their numbers. It appears that much of that money is being used to support the wilderness information center and its staff.			
5764	Alternative B proposes river protection zones to preserve natural river processes and protect critical salmon habitat, including the terrestrial riparian zone extending outward from each river bank. That should be added to Alterantive D.			
5765	Finally I urge you, the U.S. Park Service, to give the Queets maximum wilderness protection by including the northern draingage of the lower Queets River within the park. The Queets exemplifies the wilderness values and functions of Olympic National Park. Move that full boundary expansion proposal from Alternative B to the preferred alternative (D).			
5766	Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Please keep me on the mailing list as the GMP process continues.			
5767	191037		Tacoma	WA
5768	Letter on File			
5769	191192		Port Angeles	WA
5770	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for Olympic National Park. I am a lifelong Olympic Peninsula resident and currently own a home on Lake Crescent, which has been in my family for over 70 years.			
5771	My overall feeling towards this plan is Alternative "A", do nothing. It appears to be the one you can most afford and has the least impact on the current use of "our" park. Comments on specific "Hot Buttons" of mine are:			
5772	No increase in the Park's land holdings. To take productive timberland out of production is only another blow to the already depressed economy of the Peninsula. I OPPOSE ANY EXPANSION OF THE PARK!			
5773	No restrictions on motorized watercraft on Lake Ozette. There aren't enough motorized watercraft on that lake to even be a concern. The current launching sites create enough restriction as it is. That is a big lake and the wind kicks up around noon each day; it can get very rough. If I was in a canoe and in trouble, there's nothing I woudl welcom more than a nice 20 foot power boat. I OPPOSE ANY RESTRICTIONS ON MOTORIZED WATERCRAFT ON LAKE OZETTE AND LAKE CRESCENT.			
5774	Leave the Olympic Hot Springs as is. Many people come from all over the country to enjoy those natural springs. The existing campgroun does not need "rehabilitating"; it works just fine for the lited use it gets. Removing the existing pools would be like removing the Bronco's from Denver while refurbishing Invesco Field; what woudl be the point of refurbishing? LEAVE THE HOT SPRINGS, CAMPGROUND, AND ITS ACCESS JUST THE WAY IT IS.			
5775	MOving the Kalalock Lodge and Highway 101 is the most ludicrous idea I've heard in a long time. For a fraction of the cost, why not simply armor the bank of Kalalock Creek near the Lodge and install some natural root-wad and/or log barriers to stem the winter storm erosion?			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5776	188361		Port Angeles	WA
5777	Dear National Park Service managers,			
5778	I am a resident of Port Angeles and a huge supporter of Olympic National Park and our National Park System in general. I have visited nearly all of our nation's National Parks and Monuments, and I can say without bias that, outside of Alaska's Wilderness Areas, Olympic National Park is the most pristine park in this nation, with fewer roads, cleaner water and better wildlife habitat. Please help to preserve ONP's unique character and qualities by adopting a long-range plan that will increase, rather than decrease conservation measures.			
5779				
5780	Tourism and development allow many people to appreciate our Park and also bring vital economic resources into our community. Destroying the "goose that lays the golden egg" will result in long term economic loss to our community. It would be short-sighted to allow new developments to encroach on the beauty of the Park itself and destroy the resources that visitors came to see. New developments are best located outside Park boundaries where the economic benefits can best be utilized by locally owned businesses rather than government run concessions.			
5781	Instead of spearheading development, as a voting citizen, I count on my National Park Service to staunchly defend, protect and restore natural resources. Such activities include reintroduction of extirpated species like the wolf and the fisher. They also include protection of watersheds and consequently of the salmon habitat that makes the entire state of Washington a tourist destination, a gourmet capital, and home to a rich fishing industry.			
5782	I strongly urge the policy makers involved to defer all decisions regarding wilderness and natural resource management until a complete wilderness plan is available. I also hope that you will seriously consider proposed Alternative B in regards to establishing River Protection Zones and extending Park Boundaries along the Queets, Quinault, Hoh Rivers and along Lake Crescent and Lake Ozette. Conversely, it would be unconscionable to actually further develop within Park Boundaries. Please follow Alternative Plan A and allow no further developments to occur inside the Park. Finally, I urge that the Park take a much more active role in law enforcement of illegal logging that has occurred within remote Park Boundaries over the most recent years.			
5783	187976		Longview	WA
5784	I so love our Olympic National Park. Miles and miles of wild places to explore. What a jewel in the 21st century. I pray the powers to be will never fold to the pressure and allow motorized vehicles or mountain bikes of any kind into our tressured back country.			
5785	191165	Quileute Tribal Council	La Push	WA
5786	Letter on File			
5787	190727		Sekiu	WA
5788	I think that it is very important to keep motorized boats on Lake Ozette for safety reasons. The lake needs more access not less. The taxpayer has a right to have access and be able to use the lake and surrounding area there should be more day parks and walking trail biking and horseback trails there should be accessibility for handicap and senior citizens.			
5789	190677	Olympic Forest Coalition/Olympic Park Associates	Sequim	WA
5790	Support Alternative B minimizing all human intrusion, beyond wilderness/wildlife habitat would be a dis-service to the future of the peninsula. A wilderness plan would be helpful and should be in the plan.			
5791	Do not want increased commercial activity; especially on park land all new services should be on private land.			
5792	More river protection rebuilding is detrimental to salmon/wildlife causes future problems.			
5793	Need to be more assertive in species fisher, wolf, salmon.			
5794	190792	Friends of Miller Peninsula State Park	Sequim	WA
5795	Friends of Miller Peninsula State Park was established in the early 1990s to protect the natural ecosystem of 3000 acres of State Park undeveloped lands near Sequim, Washington. Our goal is to promote the preservation of wild lands within the State Park system as much as is possible within the State's planning process.			
5796	We applaud the National Park plan to responsibly manage Olympic lands for future decades, but am uncomfortable that the planning alternatives are presented without the completion of a comprehensive wilderness plan. Several controversial issues are difficult to respond to without a wilderness management plan.			
5797	Recent discussion of restoration of extirpated species has been encouraging. We would like to see Park planners emphasize efforts to restore carnivores, like the fisher, and eventually the wolf. Such efforts would be very positive in an effort to rejuvenate the integrity of the Park's natural ecosystem.			
5798	Salmon are perhaps the most essential element of any restoration project. For this reason, we urge the park to recommend eligible rivers for Wild and Scenic river designation. This would strengthen Alternative B specifically, by adding river protection zones.			
5799	Expanding the Park boundaries is critical. Park planner recommended actions should include complete watersheds, as much as possible, within the five areas: Ozette Lake, Lake Crescent, and the Queets, Quinault, and Hoh river systems.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5800	Please do not expand developed areas or developed zones. All proposed recreational and private developments should not be located on Park lands. They should be outside the National Park.			
5801	We applaud the Park Service for recommending wilderness study for Ozette Lake, and for progressive idea of establishing Olympic Coast intertidal reserves.			
5802	The Olympic is a world heritage Park. Alternative D falls short in recognizing this, because of its focus on motorized use and development. More emphasis should be on preserving ecological integrity. The GMP draft is a good start.			
5803	We appreciate the opportunity to comment.			
5804	190807		Olympia	N/A
5805	I endorse the Olympic Park Associates' recommendations regarding the GMP, especially as regards			
5806				
5807	· Restoration of extirpated species like the wolf and fisher.			
5808	· Establishment of river protection zones to ensure critical salmon habitats and preserve natural			
5809	river processes, as proposed in Alternative B.			
5810	Recommendation of all 13 eligible rivers for federal Wild and Scenic river designation.			
5811	Limiting development zones inside park boundaries to current uses, and locating new commercial developments,			
5812	campgrounds and RV parks outside (rather than within) the park.			
5813	191191		Silver Spring	MD
5814	Letter on File			
5815	191152		Elma	WA
5816	Letter on File			
5817	188593		Newberg	OR
5818	I believe that we are part of nature and that as such, any alterations that we have made to the Olympic Hot Springs would be 'natural' and should be left in place. I mean really, what is it hurting? If we eliminate the pools will the fish be happier? I doubt that they care. Please, oh please don't take away one of 'natural' resources. Thanks for your time, JBYRD			
5819	188721		Bothell	WA
5820	I support the alternative Plan B as my first option, my second option would be Plan D.			
5821	188549		Port Hadlock	WA
5822	Alternative C compares favorably with the preferred alternative because it provides benefits not well described in the EIS. For example, additional development that is done in an environmentally sensitive manner provides environmental benefit to other national parks by redistributing the demands on the system. Some national parks find their resources overextended, and development in Olympic national park will reduce these overloads elsewhere. Other benefits accrue to the local community, including economic development such as that found around other national parks. In Glacier, Yosemite, and Yellowstone Parks, access roads are provided that provide wilderness and recreational opportunities to all people, regardless of their mobility. The current lack of access into the interior of Olympic national park discriminates against the elderly, the disabled, and others who do not have the ability to hike long distances into the wilderness. Jefferson County is bisected by the ONP, and it is not possible for vehicles to drive in Jefferson County from one end of the County to the other.			
5823	This lack of basic connectivity adversely impacts emergency services, provision of government services to west County residents, and restricts economic development and recreational opportunities. The lack of a good highway also results in significant numbers of highway accidents on US 101 and elsewhere with fatalities and injuries that could be avoided by provision of reasonable access to and through the park. In summary, failure to consider the full range of impacts caused by overly restrictive measures causes the EIS to favor an alternative that does not meet national and community needs. Alternative C would be demonstrated to be the preferred alternative if the full range of benefits of Alternative C were analyzed correctly and completely.			
5824	188551		Port Orchard	WA
5825	Olympic National Park should be maintained as a wild ecosystem. There should be no increased development. Existing development should be maintained or improved to facilitate the Olympic National Park as a refuge and wilderness, not as a theme park.			
5826	188552		freeland	WA
5827	thank you for the opportunity to comment on these issues.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5828	As a financial supporter and avid user of the parks resources, I am primarily concerned about the natural resources being maintained, rescued and secured over the development of tourist			
5829	entertainments and comforts. I encourage the conservation of the resource with fair and appropriate access over the excessive and commercial invasions. Thank you.			
5830	188564		Seattle	WA
5831	It would be great to see a middle ground between Alternatives B and D. Largely focusing on conservation and wilderness areas. However, it's important that people continue to visit and learn from the park. Future generations must learn and understand why parks such as this are so important for our environment on global and local scales.			
5832	Please refrain from adding additional pavement and large facilities.			
5833	190146		federal way	WA
5834	Please open up the Dose road!			
5835	190659		Bellingham	WA
5836	Most people are unaware that the temperate rain forest of our Olympic Peninsula is one of the rarest ecosystems in the world, and that the			
5837	animals and plants existing only there have been largely uncatalogued. Scientists do not know what is needed to sustain that rich diversity of			
5838	life. I strongly urge you not to risk the health of our forests, food, water, air, and, thereby, ourselves by altering one of the precious few			
5839	unique natural areas left to sustain us.			
5840	I applaud you for preserving the outer coast intertidal strip. The protection of our beaches has already made a step toward preserving the			
5841	lovely Snowy Plover. Thank you also for recommending a wilderness study			
5842	for Ozette Lake.			
5843	As proposed in Alternative B, please obtain a secure buffer of Ozette Lake and Lake Crescent and the Hoh, Quinault, and Queets river watershed zones to allow natural river			
5844	processes and to maintain critical fish			
5845	habitats. All thirteen (13) eligible rivers need to be federal Wild and Scenic river designations.			
5846	I also ask that you keep all developed areas and development zones in the park at their current size - as stated in Alternative A. NO NEW AND			
5847	NO EXPANDED developed areas, development zones or commercial concessions inside the park boundary. Federal court THOROUGHLY REFUTED the park's claim that historic			
5848	structures of all types "enhance wilderness character". The park should be enjoyed as it is.			
5849	Plan to re-introduce animals, the wolves and fishers, that once were native there.			
5850	Controversial decisions regarding designated Wilderness need to be deferred until a comprehensive wilderness management plan can be			
5851	completed, and I request it. Illegal elk hunting from nearby roads is a continuing problem and this, among many other things, must be addressed.			
5852	Thank you for this opportunity to speak strongly for the preservation of the Olympic National Park, truly a national treasure.			
5853	188674		Spanaway	WA
5854	All trails that are currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness area which are open to stock should remain open to stock in the ONP General Management Plan and not be zoned as			
5855	either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness			
5856	Zone. I have enjoyed many hours of riding in the Olympic Park Wilderness area. I practice "Leave No Trace" (NLT) and encourage others to do the same.			
5857	188565		Gig Harbor	WA
5858	All trails that are currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness area that are currently open to saddle and pack stock should remain open to saddle and pack stock in the ONP General			
5859	Management Plan and not be zoned as either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone as both will be off-limits to stock.			
5860	190202		Brinnon	WA
5861	I believe Alternative D - Preferred Alternative to be the best course on these proposals. As civilization moves closer and closer to this wonderful wilderness area, various spots can			
5862	be accessed IN A CONTROLLED MANNER so visitors not only enjoy the area but, more importantly, have an opportunity to truly learn about its beauty by experiencing it firsthand.			
5863	Through this, I hope more people will call for protecting the Olympic National Forest and the life it sustains.			
5864	188566		Port Angeles	WA
5865	All trails that are currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness area that are currently open to stock should remain open to stock in the ONP General Management Plan and not be			
5866	zoned as either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone" (both will be off-limits to stock). pcd			
5867	188641		shoreline	WA
5868	leave the park as a wild ecosystem			
5869	188683		West	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5863	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We are from eastern Washington but we have enjoyed much of Olympic, my family has a soft spot for the park in our hearts. Overall I support alternate C, we need more access. The one exception is for the Kaloch ares, there I support alternate D. Reouthign the highway so there is a bypass around Kaloch is a good idea.		Richland	
5864	188572			
5865	As avid recreational horseback riders, my husband and I feel that all trails in the Olympic Park Wilderness area that are currently open to stock should remain open to stock in the ONP General Management Plan and not be zoned as either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone.	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, Skagit Chapter	Oak Harbor	WA
5866	We feel that the history of the benefits of the use of horses and mules in our country is undisputed, and trails open to stock should not be reduced in the present day.			
5867	Stock users, for the most part, are and will continue to be good stewards and caretakers of the lands on which we travel. Please do not reduce our recreational opportunities.			
5868	188554		Bellevue	WA
5869	I believe that Olympic National Park should be developed for vistors and tourism. The park is so huge yet so much is inaccessible.			
5870	188668			
5871	Please keep trails open to equestrian use. We work on trails and need to retain that historic right to recreational stock use on trails.	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington	Roy	WA
5872	188632			
5873	I want to preserve the horsemen right to ride their horses and mules on the trails that presently exist in the forests, whether they be national, wilderness or state-owned/managed.	Nisqually Chapter BCHW	Yelm	WA
5874	190197			
5875	Please keep the trails open for equine pleasure riding and packing. As I understand Plan C would work best.	Nisqually BCHW	Yelm	WA
5876	I have ridden in Dosewalips in the Olympics and would like to see that road repaired. could it go higher to avoid the river washing out the road again?			
5877	The trail built around the washout is fine.			
5878	188699			
5879	To Whom It May Concern,	Back Country Horsemen	Arlington	WA
5880				
5881	My family & enjoy I riding horses on Washington trails and it is important to us that all trails currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness area which are open to stock should remain open to stock in the ONP General Management Plan and not be zoned as either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone.			
5882	188567		Newcastle	WA
5883	I tend to favor expansion of the park where possible, moving roads out of the floodplain, and keeping development areas to a minimum - denser if necessary (e.g. bigger buildings closer together) with a small footprint. Saving wilderness and wildlife is a high priority for me - I've backpacked in coastal and mountain zones and also enjoyed staying at lodges. KEEP MOTORIZED USE TO A MINIMUM - on Lake Crescent, ban noisy jet skis, require quiet electric motors on motorboats. Avoid overflights by planes - quiet is an essential part of the park/wilderness experience.			
5884	190972			
5885	I endorse Olympic Park Associate's vision to maintain, and where possible, to restore the Olympic National Park wilderness ecosystem with it's "original components and habitat functions intact."		Port Townsend	WA
5886	I do not want to see anymore commercialism. I don't like the out door lights on the bathrooms in some park campgrounds. Seeing the stars from the parks, without light pollution is amazing. I have seen people hanging tarps from trees just trying to keep the light out of their campsites.			
5887	Hearing the jets from Widbey Island training over head is wrong, the commercial jets are bad enough but now this added to it. Where and when are we going to draw the line on pollution, I say now and lets take the parks back to the way our ancestors put them aside for us, so we can leave them that way for the future generations.			
5888	188648		Seattle	WA
5889	Please keep Olympic National Park as is. Do not open it up for further tourism! Over population is ruining our state--don't let it ruin our treasured parks as well!			
5890	188663		Renton	WA
5891	I generally favor greater visitor access. The preferred alternatives are OK with me.			
5892	190231			
5893	we support the Right to Ride and keep our trails open to use with our equines. we are responsible citizens and work with the local and national government on the betterment of our trails	back country horseman	mckenna	WA
5894	188559		Covington	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5895	The maps for Alternatives C and D both list "a universally accessible frontcountry trail" to be developed. I cannot find a definition of this kind of trail (can it mean wheelchair accessible?) or a description of where this trail would be located. It appears that a single trail in some unspecified location is intended.			
5896	188728		Seattle	WA
5897	I think the Preferred Alternative D, is about right on track. In general, I would like to see existing facilities in the park maintained, but no new ones created. However, some improvements are needed, such as re-opening roads that are closed (Queets, Dosewallips).			
5898	188589	horse owner/rider	Elma	WA
5899	I am hoping to help keep horse trails open for people to use.			
5900	I am 64 and started to ride again and it seems that its hard to find a safe place to ride my horse. when I do I enjoy it. horseback riding is great. being out doors in the fresh air. so close to nature that its Godly. as close to him as I will ever get.			
5901	hope I did this right...			
5902	thank you for reading this.			
5903	and please no atvs...			
5904	188557	BCHW	Grayland	WA
5905	All trails that are currently in the Olympic Park Wilderness area that are currently open to stock should remain open to stock in the ONP General Management Plan and not be zoned as either Primitive Wilderness Zone or Primeval Wilderness Zone.			
5906	190176		Tenino	WA
5907	Recently the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously passed the Right to Ride Bill (HR 586). It is now before the Senate and I would like it to be supported.			
5908	This bill is very important in keeping a part of U.S. history alive. Pack and saddle stock have been an integral part of our history from the time of the conquistadors, Lewis and Clarkâ-"s Corp of Discovery, the mountain men, the emigration of our ancestors from the east to the west, and as a method of enjoying our mountains and our forests for many years. John Muir, Ansel Adams, and Gifford Pinchot were just a few of our famous environmentalists who used pack and saddle stock to explore areas of the backcountry. These men were instrumental in getting Congress to preserve many parts of the backcountry for all to enjoy.			
5909	Yet today citizens who use recreational pack and saddle stock are under a constant threat by federal land managers. They want to restrict and/or ban pack and saddle stock from using federal lands that are and should be open to all of us. They do not have any specific or safety reasons for doing this, only pressure from special interest groups who want to keep these areas pure for their own benefit.			
5910	The bill does not ask that new trails be constructed or the ones already closed to be opened. It is just having Congress tell the federal land mangers that recreational pack and saddle stock must be allowed to use the trails where they have historically done so in the past.			
5911	In Washington State one of the recreational groups that utilize pack and saddle stock,			
5912	** Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, Contributed over 62,000 volunteer hours in 2005 worth over \$1,000,000.00 in savings to the taxpayers maintaining many miles of trails for all users. ** Without this group many, many miles of trails will be closed to all users, not just pack and saddle stock.			
5913	This bill is essential in allowing pack and saddle stock users to contribute positively to the recreational community as well as allowing them to continue to enjoy the areas where they have historically done so.			
5914	190317		Forks	WA
5915	I very strongly believe Kalaloch Alternative A is the only reasonable plan within the given alternatives. The main reason is the proposals to move Highway 101 out of the park boundaries. First I saw that the state DOT was not formally consulted according to the list of state agencies notified. Second: the cost would be prohibitive since the state cannot afford to repair existing highways as it should and the park service claims that it cannot find the money to repair the flood damage to the Queets valley road within the park. Third: moving the highway would cause many times worse environmental damage to salmon and steelhead streams and the Queets/Clearwater flood plains than repairing or maintaining the existing highway. Fourth: The required land taking for the purpose of moving the highway would potentially cause more hardship to the landowners and the state than most people in the area think the NPS is even worth.			
5916	There is great bitterness in this state in the way that the NPS has ridden roughshod over the landowners in the past. When your statement refers to "willing buyer/seller" the willingness of the seller is ultimately at gunpoint. While I used to admire the aims of the aims of the NPS, I find that I am no longer convinced that those aims are as much for the people and the future generations as for a bureaucratic land grab for a larger empire within the federal gov't. Overall I believe that the proposed changes are too costly.		North Bend	WA
5917	190145		Redmond	WA

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5918	A few comments: I think that the owners of private land surrounding or on Lake Ozette should receive some kind of decision priority when it comes to the official laws governing the area of National Park in which we vacation and enjoy many weekends during the summer months. As a partner of owners of Rocky Point, which has been in our family for more than 30 years, it seems that although we may be a minority (who else owns land out there) I would hate to have the state of Washington decide how we can use the property even though we were outnumbered 10000 to 1 by registered voters.			
5919	By possibly limiting power boats on the water, you have basically eliminated our way of maintaining and up keeping our cabin.			
5920	That being said, I understand something needs to be done to protect the Park. I have reviewed the four alternatives - over night parking at Swan Bay is a must for us, as that is where we leave our cars once the MOTOR boat is in the water.			
5921	Solution: Parking and Boating permits! Private owners pay a small annual fee to access the lake as care takers. This would allow us access and yet keep the traffic to a minimum. Why not, we have been actively taking care of the lake for 30 years - I am sure the general public would disagree, but hey, longevity of ownership should have special privileges. I am sure my neighbors would be upset if I told them their land was now a National Park and she/he could no longer use a motor to mow his/her lawn. Thanks for a say in this very important topic, I will be in strong support of BOATS ON THE WATER.			
5922	190971		Tacoma	WA
5923	The following are my comments on the Olympic National Park Draft General Management Plan (GMP) dated May 2006.			
5924	Alternative A gets my approval. While there are some appealing recommendations, they come with many more serious flaws. I also note I have little confidence my voice will be heard, since my experience over 40 years with Olympic National Park causes me to conclude the park management has already made all the key decisions. Going through the comment process only gives the illusion of considering citizen input. In fact, ONP specifically ruled out accepting or considering comments signed in petition format by effected citizens groups such as the inholders in the Lake Ozette area. Nevertheless, as a good and concerned citizen and in the hope of actually making a difference, I offer the following:			
5925	I oppose inclusion of additional lands as an unwise use of taxpayer money. No specific evidence is offered to show the necessity for additional land acquisition and, indeed, ONP does a generally poor job of maintaining the lands and facilities it currently owns. Additionally, removal of additional lands from local and state tax rolls places an unfair burden on those governments and their citizens. It is a fact ONP does not pay its fair share to maintain local and state services even considering the PILT (payment in lieu of taxes) payments. PILT payments are far below what would be derived from a fair tax assessment. Additionally, lands locked up under ONP management or Legacy Forest produce no income leading to job loss in an already economically depressed area. It must be clearly stated that all land acquisition will occur under the willing seller-willing buyer policy.			
5926	While it is popular and politically correct to vilify logging operations, in fact no clear evidence exists to connect any logging under current forest practices with degradation of spawning grounds in the Lyre River origin and Lake Crescent outlet area. Rather the silting more correctly occurs as a result of atmospheric particulates into lake water where it accumulates on the lake bottom. What sediment does enter from runoff is naturally occurring as a result of rainfall on all slopes surrounding the lake not just those north and west of the ONP boundary in this area.			
5927	I specifically object to removal of back country shelters. These shelters are an historic part of the Park and provide visitors with a safety net otherwise unavailable. While they do concentrate visitor impact, they serve to protect surrounding areas from adverse impact that would otherwise occur.			
5928	There is considerable discussion of the perceived lack of appropriate funding for Park operations. Actually it is a matter of where and how the available funding is expended. The Park has received increased funding each year for the past 5 years. The real question is one of operational priorities. The priority should be in support of the greatest number of visitors and users which is the front country and road side areas. These have been conspicuously neglected in the past.			
5929	I also see no mention of performance audits anywhere in the document. These operations reviews are essential in delivering an appropriate level of services at the most economical cost. The recommendations improve the level of efficiency. They answer the questions: "Are we doing the right thing? Are we doing them in the most efficient manner? Are we doing things we should not be doing?" I strongly recommend independent performance audits be conducted of all Park activities. I have serious questions whether leasing of Rosemary Lodge as well as other ONP property on Lake Crescent to Olympic Park Institute for \$1 per year is good use of citizen assets. I request an independent performance audit of ONP preferential treatment of ONI.			
5930	I encourage retention of motorized watercraft on Lake Ozette. Inholders routinely access their property using them. I support maintaining road access to all inholdings.			
5931	Removal of the Elwha dams, while politically correct and well intentioned, removes a low polluting source of electrical power and fails to address the impact of Native American fishing policies and the effects of international fishing practices on the high seas. I see no reasonable probability of restoring the Chinook salmon runs to pre dam levels despite the cost of dam removal and silt mitigation. There are too many unaddressed negative factors that degrade the restoration process.			
5932	Thank you for your consideration of my comments.			
5933	190038		Shelton	WA
5934	I generally favor increased accessibility in areas already developed.			

	A	B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5935	We drive up to Hurricane Ridge every weekend in the winter to snowshoe, snowboard and downhill ski. I think it would be great if they were allowed a chair lift to replace the poma lift, as well as upgrade the ski school trailer to a permanent building.			
5936	Also, and this may seem far fetched, build an ariel tram from park HQ to the Ridge and limit the number of private vehicles to bus and concession support?			
5937	My choice for Hurricane Ridge is Option #D.			
5938				
5939	I would like access to Deer Park in the winter. It would take pressure off of Hurricane Ridge. How about a ski hut and a sno-cat taxi? My choice for Deer Park is #C.			
5940	I haven't been to Dosewallips since the road fell. Get it fixed and keep it fixed. I choose #D for Dosewallips.			
5941				
5942	I use the Staircase area for backpacking trips into the park and Wonder Mt. wilderness area. I use the four stream road a lot.			
5943	Do not close it. I choose #C.			
5944				
5945	188569	Backcountry Horsemen of Washington	Yelm	WA
5946	Park Management Planners,			
5947	During your planning process for the proposed park, I would appreciate you keeping in mind the many stock users that will utilize this park. Horseback users will constitute a large percentage of the users, as well has contributing in a positive way toward maintenance of this resource.			
5948	Thank you for supporting our cause and helping to keep our natural areas open for all users.			
5949	188673		Seattle	WA
5950	I visit Olympic NP approximately 10 days per year. The visits include day trips to extended hikes and camping. I prefer to keep the present level of development (option 1) for Hurr ridge, Sol Duc, Elwah, and Coastal regions. Increased visitor services would diminish wilderness attributes, but closing and limiting access routes as described in option 2's would make access impossible for much of the deeper areas of the park. The preferred options (4s) for Hurricane ridge and Elway would make it more crowded, and would potentially spoil the current private character of the Hot Springs.			
5951	188643		Olympia	WA
5952	I have reviewed options A-D. in the document list. I have chosen to comment only on those areas I am familiar with.			
5953	HEADQUARTERS: I prefer plan C with one exception: I believe that the Heart of the Hills campground may suffer from overuse. I recommend it be converted to day use.			
5954	HURRICANE RIDGE: Plan D			
5955	ELWHA: Plan A			
5956	LAKE CRESCENT: Plan D			
5957	SOL DUC: Plan C			
5958	MORA: Plan C. Plus I favor working with the Quilleyute Tribe to enlarge their tribal area.			
5959	KALALOCH: Plan C as it retains the Hwy 101 views. I actually like Plan D but as I drive the Washington coast monthly I favor retaining water views.			
5960	DEER PARK: Plan B			
5961	WILDERNESS ALTERNATIVES: Plan C. I am a horseback rider & favor the wider trails & stock standards for trails in this plan.			
5962				
5963	General comments: I grew up in Port Angeles with the ONP my backyard. I learned to ski at Hurrigan Ridge. During the 1960's I rode horseback throughout the 7 Lakes Basin area, over the Low Divide & High Divide, up the Bogie & on Ruby Beach. Rightfully the park has limited horse access out of environmentally sensitive areas.			
5964	I favor retaining current access as outlined on your website: http://www.nps.gov/olyw/wic/stock.htm			
5965	and whenever possible expanding frontcountry access to include horsecamp grounds, with space for trucks/trailers, & daytrip riding. I especially favor this along Kalaloch's beaches.			
5966	190562		Edmonds	WA
5967	The "preferred" options seemed to strike a generally good balance, although in a few places I might lean towards more concern for preserving the wild experience.			
5968	It is important to give people who cannot hike far a chance to get out of their cars and away from the road with some universal trails. Also to have the maintained trails for those of us getting older who like to walk for a couple miles but no longer can backpack or rock scramble.			
5969				
5970	It is especially important to make sure that everyone is there to savor the natural beauty, not to grab one snapshot or some fast food right next to their car or bus.			
5971				
5972	Encouraging cross country skiing rather than downhill best fits the Park's purpose.			

A		B	C	D
1	Correspondence ID	Organization	City	State/ Provin
2	Correspondence			
5973	I prefer private car access at the times and places where the visitor load will allow it. Providing a few more trailheads to spread the parking and traffic would help.			
5974				
5975	None of the other "Visitor Opportunity" options were appealing.			
5976	188685 I have long imagined that when i retire it will be to Quinault. Much of the reason for this is that i hope to wander throughout the National Park when i am done confining myself to cities. In recent years my mobility has begun to degrade. This has led to my re-visualizing this retirement ideal from hiking/camping to horse/camping. I do not know the present regulations about horses on trails in the areas uphill from the North Fork Ranger Station and the Graves Creek Campground. If, however, horses are currently allowed there, and if the question has arisen whether or not to prohibit them: my tentative vote would be to not introduce a new prohibition on horses in that region of the park. (That's a purely selfish personal preference without knowledge of context such as trends in trail erosion or watershed pollution attributable to horse traffic and so on, which are factors that might reverse my preference if i knew about them since i value the preservation of the wilderness above my own transient subjective experience.)		Berkeley	CA
5977				
5978				
5979	That's all i have an opinion about at this time, i am largely uninformed as yet: it should be as much as another decade before i retire.			
5980				
5981	Thanks for being open to comments.			