

2 March 2011

MEMORANDUM

From: BRENDA W. WILLIAMS, ASLA

To: ALL INTERESTED PARTIES



1037 SHERMAN AVENUE
MADISON, WI 53703
608 260 8020

**RE: WASHINGTON & BARNUM ISLANDS CLR/EA
ISLE ROYALE NATIONAL PARK
PN: 20900140
GOVT: 6068090023**

Subject Public input from meeting in Duluth on 17 February 2011

A public meeting was held in Duluth, Minnesota, on 17 February 2011 to discuss the combined Cultural Landscape Report / Environmental Assessment for Washington and Barnum Islands at Isle Royale National Park. Twenty-eight people signed in as attendees of the meeting. An overview of the project was provided using the powerpoint presentation that is linked to this site.

Meeting attendees were asked to identify additional management issues and invited to craft/suggest landscape treatments that they would like to see implemented and to provide feedback related to the concepts described.

The following topics were discussed:

1. The families associated with Washington & Barnum Islands were discouraged that the presentation did not highlight the role that they have played in preserving the resources at the islands. The landscape history will be updated to include more information about these efforts.
2. A question was asked regarding the significance of the resources at Washington and Barnum Islands in relation to the resources on the mainland. An attempt will be made to determine if information relevant to this question is available.
3. A statement was made that the interpretive approach at the islands should not replace the existing family activities with a "commercial version." The report needs to clearly define the approach to interpretation and clarify that the traditional families do not need to be eliminated in order to provide increased visitor access and interpretive opportunities. There should be a clear explanation of how the families fit in to the plan. Brenda Williams explained that the CLR/EA can not necessarily indicate the groups that will undertake specific roles but that the language in the CLR/EA will not eliminate specific groups from certain roles.
4. Stuart Sivertson stated that his father (Stanley Sivertson) was an advisor to the Great Lakes Fishing Commission and his family members (including Stuart) continued these activities after Stanley's death. They gathered fish eggs and other fishery data. These activities could be supported as long as the fish that were caught could be sold once they were done with them. In

WASHINGTON, DC
ANN ARBOR, MI
MADISON, WI

WWW.QUINNEVANS.COM

2007 Great Lakes fisheries researchers came together and collected information, but because they could not sell the resulting catch, the fish had to be dumped at the end of the work. Mr. Sivertson indicated that a 1950s law authorized commercial fishing at Isle Royale, however a Michigan fishing license is required, and the state of Michigan will not issue any commercial fishing licenses. The loss of the last fishing license for the Sivertson fishery means the end of commercial fishing here, unless the NPS helps to develop a solution. Mr. Sivertson requested that a treatment concept be developed that incorporates a commercial fishing operation with the appropriate licenses and activities necessary to operate a viable business.



5. A suggestion was made that an assessment license might be obtained from MDNR. There is a continuing need for data for research purposes, and currently the data is lacking. Could Washington & Barnum Islands serve as a fishery research station? Would this work as well or better than another site elsewhere?
6. Tom Johns indicated that his family has spent substantial funds on preserving the Johns hotel and log house.
7. Consideration of camping in the project area needs to take into account other comparable campsites. Alex Strand's harbor is just outside the north gap and has a good site that has better canoe access and a nice camp site. Attendees asked if NPS knows how much use that site gets.
8. Would a camp site on Booth Island or Johns Island be more logical than one on Washington or Barnum?
9. A suggestion was made that in order to determine if camping or other activities are realistic for the project area, research should be conducted to determine the needs of the primary recreational user groups. Brenda Williams explained that that type of work would have been incorporated into the GMP project, and is not included in the CLR/EA.
10. Consider restoring the former Singer dock and using it for visitor access to Washington Island. The cribbing is still in place, and the water depth at this location is the best for boats.
11. Consideration of using partnerships to help preserve and interpret the resources was emphasized.
12. The families and their cultural traditions should be considered as resources and should be preserved as significant resources in the treatment plan.
13. It was suggested that having the families participate in living history activities might be an effective interpretive approach.
14. The possibility of IRI establishing an environmental heritage center at the project site was mentioned.
15. Development of any programs at Washington and Barnum Islands needs to carefully consider the potential that the programs have to compete with other marginal programs in the region. A new program should not threaten the existence of an established program.
16. An attendee asked why it is acceptable that visitors are not welcomed at the maintenance facility at Mott, but not acceptable that they are not welcome at Washington and Barnum Islands.



17. The comment was made that giving visitors free access to the islands would be a safety issue and that there would be increased impacts to the historic resources.
18. The island families are reluctant to trust that the NPS will not erase their historical associations with the landscape by removing them and the resources from the project area. Ms. Williams explained that evaluation of the potential impacts of the hands-off management approach is being included in the report as a treatment concept that was considered and dismissed because it would violate the GMP by allowing significant resources to deteriorate.
19. A question was asked about National Register status of the buildings and how that would affect options for use and management of them. The cultural resources within the project area are considered to be eligible for the National Register, as they are significant cultural resources related to early settlement, recreation, tourism, and commercial fishing at Isle Royale. As such, management decisions that may impact the integrity of these resources are required to undergo compliance review.
20. Suggestions for how to accommodate public access to the project area included:
 - a. Utilizing the current concession boat, establish a tour opportunity that includes an approximately one-hour stop at Washington Island after leaving Windigo. Visitors could walk around Washington Island for an hour before leaving on the boat.
 - b. Utilizing the current concession boat, establish a tour opportunity that includes a harbor tour. The boat would navigate around the harbor with an interpreter on board explaining the historic aspects of the project area. Visitors would not get off the boat, but could see the landscape and interpretive materials would be provided on the boat.

END OF MEMORANDUM