

PEPC 191187

Olympic National Park General Management Plan
National Park Service, Denver Service Center
P. O. Box 25287
Denver, CO 80225

RECEIVED

OCT - 4 2006

DSC-P

Fenton, MI 48430

To the Park Service:

I grew up in Washington State and often return to visit. On my visits I sometimes return to the National Parks there, and have enjoyed very much going to the Olympic National Park. I have the following comments regarding the changes proposed to the Lake Ozette area.

I oppose Draft General Management Plan alternatives B, C, and D for Lake Ozette and support only alternative A. I oppose the land acquisition alternatives for the following reasons:

It is my understanding the when the proposed boundary changes were announced, some owners accelerated the removal of timber in eligible areas, taking advantage of the process to profit twice (once by selling all remaining timber of value and again in expected sale of the land to the Park Service), while damaging the areas the Park Service proposed to designate as wilderness.

The Park Service should have planned ahead for this and should have prevented it by warning owners that their land would be ineligible for purchase if they made significant timber harvests after the announcement. If the Park Service goes ahead and acquires the above land, this would be rewarding this behavior of profiting by damaging the land. I oppose rewarding this kind of behavior.

Therefore, I oppose any option that involves acquisition of land where timber was harvested in the way described above.

Acquiring the land would, in my opinion, have a negative economic effect on the area (which already has high unemployment) in terms of tax revenues lost to the county and local business losses tied to the reduction of visitors to the park lands caused by land use restrictions proposed in alternatives B, C, and D.

I oppose these alternatives because of their negative economic impact, and support only alternative A.

Finally, I believe that, due to Park Service budgetary constraints, the Park Service cannot effectively manage the current amount of land that it has to work with. I know that this is not the fault of the Park Service, but rather that of misguided national priorities, and I strongly support greater funding. However, a plan which would further stretch Park Service resources is also misguided.

Alternatives B, C, and D would only increase the amount of land under Park Service jurisdiction, thus increasing this problem, and I oppose these alternatives for this reason, also.

I ask that the Park Service please give my concerns serious consideration.

Sincerely,

