



Introduction

Olympic National Park held public meetings in six communities around the park from March through April 2014 to share the preliminary draft alternatives that had been developed for the park's Wilderness Stewardship Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (WSP/EIS). These communities included Port Angeles, Forks, Port Townsend, Amanda Park, Shelton, and Seattle. A total of 209 people signed in at the public meetings.

A total of 1064 pieces of correspondence were received via the planning website (www.parkplanning.nps.gov/olymwild), email, formal letter, or hardcopy form completed and submitted at a public meeting. Correspondence was received from people in at least 42 cities or communities in Washington State; at least 47 states and Washington, D.C.; as well as from nine countries including Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. We also heard from federal agencies, tribal members and representatives, city and county representatives, non-governmental organizations, park concessioners, and local business owners.

This document includes the full text of all comments (correspondences) received during the public comment period for the preliminary draft alternatives for the WSP/EIS. All comments are verbatim; grammatical and typographical errors have not been modified. The names and addresses of private individuals have been removed unless the commenter included this information within the text of their comment; names of individuals representing businesses or organizations may be included.

These comments reflect the sentiments of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire public and may not accurately reflect actual existing conditions on the ground or in park management. The public comment process does not serve as a voting mechanism. The park considers the content of all comments equally; comments are not weighted based on the number of times a comment is received.

Many commenters referred to the Topic Questions provided during the comment period. These questions are listed below for your reference. The purpose of the questions was to help commenters frame their responses. The questions were not meant to limit responses or comments in any way. Commenters were given the option to use or not use these questions in their comments.

- 1) Is this a sufficient range of alternatives? If not, please provide further suggestion(s).
- 2) What do you like about the alternatives?
- 3) Are there specific elements you feel should be changed? If yes, how would you change them?
- 4) Please share any additional comments or suggestions.

Some comments pertained to subject matter that is irrelevant to the WSP/EIS and will not be addressed within the plan, but will be documented in the administrative record for this project. These topics include, but are not limited to, those related to Hurricane Ridge Road, Dosewallips Road (USFS), Deer Park Road, Waterhole Hut, Wild Olympics and Wild & Scenic River Designation, non-wilderness facilities and activities, and public transit systems.

Full-text Public Scoping Comments

Correspondence ID: 1 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Private citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Mar,12,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I just find it difficult to support anything that Olympic National Park does. Nothing that you do EVER benefits the private citizen. Your "agenda" is to remove all residents living as inholders and making life difficult for adjoining property owners. You are a rogue agency that answers to no one.

I participated in your meeting here in Quinault, mainly to find out what sort of plan Washington D.C. Has concocted for us now.

It is hard for me to predict, but I know one thing - it WILL NOT benefit the private citizen.

As a fourth generation resident of the Quinault Valley I can say with conviction, "You are a p&ss poor neighbor".

Correspondence ID: 2 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Logger Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Mar,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Could you please quit trying to destroy what is left of our communities, the Olympic National Park is sufficient as is. At a time when our state budgets are decreasing and the state is focused on LEAN. Our politicians are now looking for more ways of destroying our way of life, our economy has suffered enough with the loss of jobs from the Spotted Owl, now you want to destroy what little we have left to sustain our communities. You want to take away my familys ability to be financialy stable. How do we sustain our way of life if you take away our occupation. I suppose that the supporters of this would suggest that we apply for TANF or some other form of Gov. hand-outs. How would you like to have your job security threatend, your selfish goals will have a lasting effect on Grays Harbor, but why do you care, you do not live here, your intire family does not rely on the timber industry in order to survive.

Topic Question 2:

The residents living in the region to be efected should be the only ones allowed to vote on this, we are the ones who will be negativly effected by the decision of those who know nothing about our culture.

Comments: Please find other things to do with your time and money, dont you have a safty commitee meeting to attend or some other way to waste our tax dollars.

Or how about our states LEAN process, where state Managers can waste thousands of man hours on coming up with a way to to improve services for Welfare recipients who cannot speak english.

Correspondence ID: 3 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. There should be an alternative that calls for more non-wilderness use and reduction of wilderness designation.

Topic Question 2:

Really nothing. Too much emphasis on wilderness already. Re-build historic shelters and similar structures. Allow motorized equipment for trail maintenance a minimum of two weeks per year. Re-open roads and remove gates.

Topic Question 3:

If the park is going to have wilderness areas they should be open to hunting. Goats management should be done by non-professional hunters licensed via the State of Washington. Hunting should be by a combination of draw tags, a few suitably high-price over-the-counter tags and by an auction tag donated to a non-profit organization similar to RMEF.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	4	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	private citizen Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	Mar,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No, it isn't. You only need two alternatives. Alternative A, leave as is. Alternative B. Increase the number of shelters, improve trails and general access to the park. Quit wasting money "educating" (I would call it indoctrinating) students and visitors.

Topic Question 2:

Nothing!!!!!! There are no alternatives to actually IMPROVE access to ONP!

Topic Question 3:

Yes, provide an alternative that will actually improve tourism on the Olympic Peninsula. INCREASE ACCESS TO OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK. It ain't rocket science!

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	5	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,15,2014 13:56:58				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It seems to be a sufficient range of wilderness *recreation* alternatives, though I'm a bit disappointed with the limited scope. It was my original impression that the WSP would address in detail other important landscape and wildlife variables that are part and parcel of a wilderness setting, and not merely backcountry visitor regulations. At the moment, it appears the WSP will devote insufficient attention to important topics such as natural fire regimes, facilitating unimpeded channel migration zones, removal/prevention of noxious weeds, and reintroducing wolves to the park. Assuming that some or all of these topics will be addressed via separate plans, please explain how all plans will interface and influence one another, how they can be integrated into a coherent management philosophy, and anticipated timing of each.

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives B and C are both reasonable attempts at managing visitor use in a manner that's compatible with unhindered wilderness processes and character over the long term. Conversely, Alternative D unacceptably prioritizes visitor access over wilderness integrity. Alternative D should be mostly disposed of, in my opinion. My preference (in a zoning context) is Alternative B, with certain modifications that I've described under Question 3. Currently, I support the following components of Alt. B: 1) Zone 5 management of most of the Skyline route on the Queets/Quinault divide, 2) prioritizing natural processes over cultural resources, 3) reductions of power tool use and

helicopter flights, 4) greatly minimizing new rec facilities, and 5) emphasis on self-directed and self-reliant visitation.

I support mandatory use of bear canisters, common to all alternatives.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B, while preferable to other alternatives in terms of zoning, should incorporate certain other priorities not currently highlighted in the summary the Park Service provided in its newsletter. Alternative C states that "healthy ecosystems would be restored and maintained through the implementation of appropriate management actions (such as the removal of non-native species, reintroduction of extirpated species, restoration of natural fire regimes, and natural channel migration). This important and applause-worthy emphasis should reasonably be included in Alternative B, as well.

I believe also that human waste bags are generally impractical on longer backpacking trips, and there is a risk that frustrated visitors may leave both the bags and the waste behind. Instead, the Park Service should mandate waste bags solely in alpine areas (above 5,000 feet) and on climbing trips. Waste bags could still be encouraged at lower elevations, with visitors otherwise educated on proper management of human waste (e.g., cat holes in forested areas, well away from water sources).

Finally, an option for online registration (with an education component) for backcountry permits should be common to all alternatives, particularly if trailhead registration is eliminated for less-visited entry points. The geography of Olympic National Park and the distances between the Park Service's offices/visitor centers are such that limiting backcountry permitting to in-person registration alone would be an unnecessary burden on the visitor and require more automobile miles driven (thus contributing to anthropogenic climate change) than would be advisable.

Comments: I hope also that the Park Service is very conservative with the addition of new quota areas and visitation limits. Although certain areas (e.g., Cape Alava) are indeed popular to the point where visitation must be limited to circumvent degradation to both the wilderness resource and the visitor's experience, land management agencies are sometimes too quick to establish such regulations. The zoning embedded in Alternative B should be sufficient in many cases to prevent the need for new quotas and use limits.

Finally, I can't emphasize enough the importance of having the full suite of the Olympic Peninsula's wildlife (at the time of Euro-American settlement) successfully reintroduced to the park, both for the sake of wilderness ecosystems and the backcountry visitor experience. This of course necessitates the return of the wolf to its rightful territory in the Olympic Mountains. Along this same vein, I'm very concerned about increased coyote predation of the Olympic marmot. The population of coyotes in the deep wilderness is far, far higher than was the case historically, almost certainly because of the absence of wolves. As Yellowstone has shown us, wolves are the sole means of reducing coyote numbers, and may well be integral to saving the Olympic marmot. The Olympic backcountry without the marmot's whistle would be the saddest of outcomes.

Correspondence ID:	6	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

The range of alternatives is sufficient. Though, if a Bear can is going to required, there needs to be an extensive and user friendly rental program that would let the community still use these areas without feeling a hassle of acquiring a bear can. A rental program would also bring a form of revenue to the park.

Topic Question 2:

The alternatives cover all areas of concern, as well as focusing not only on human impacts but also a proactive stance on removing invasive species.

Topic Question 3:

Area closings. Though I do agree on this technique, the public would need to be informed of these well in advance

of closures. The NPS does a subpar job of distributing information, especially about closures, to the public.

Comments: Alternative C is the better of the 4. It puts most emphasis on the recovery of healthy ecosystems and less about the human user.

Correspondence ID: 7 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
there is a wide selection of alternatives.

Topic Question 3:
i would add more zone 3s-f zones along the coast in alternative "C"

Comments: i like the designations in alternative c the best. i would include larger tracts of 3s-3f along the beaches.

Correspondence ID: 8 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,17,2014 16:56:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: i definitely want the public to have more access to trails/use of wilderness for hiking/camping.
so i guess 'D' is my favorite.

Correspondence ID: 9 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
not much

Topic Question 3:
no

Comments: Since I did not know about this till today, I have not had much time to look at all the options in detail. But what I think is happening is an attempt to restrict access into the park and is being driven by people who never go there. More of a it "feels good" to protect mother nature. It's like they think things dont grow back. I see no reason to change, I enjoy the park the way it is.

Correspondence ID: 10 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I don't much like the alternatives, except choice D

Topic Question 3:

Each alternative should preserve access to the Wilderness to the most extent possible. Maintaining trails and bridges.

Comments: I have hiked the Olympic National Park for over 30 years. Many places that had access by bridges are no longer available because the structures have been destroyed.

I much prefer Alternate D, because that seems like the best alternative for citizens to continue to be able to visit the Park. At the same time, it protects the habitat, flora, and fauna.

Please, Alternate D !!!! Citizens need good access to Wilderness and National Parks. Otherwise, they won't support them.

Correspondence ID: 11 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hey fed govt give the land of ONP and other lands in the West BACK TO THE STATES AND STOP TRYING TO CONTROL AND TAKE OVER LAND!

ONP is already over 100,000 acres AND DOES NOT NEED TO GROW ANYMORE!!!!!!!

REMOVE ALL UN "WORLD HERITAGE SITE DESIGNATION FROM ONP AND ALL OTHER PARKS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 12 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,18,2014 21:27:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The range of alternatives is limiting. B, C, and D all put limitations on how long people can stay and do away with self registration. All you want is more control over everyone. How about less control over people. How about trusting people to limit their own stay ? The alternatives are not really alternatives. There is not enough difference them.

Topic Question 2:

Nothing really. The alternatives all speak to having more control over people except the first one which is the best. Do nothing. Why does government always have to be doing something.

Topic Question 3:

I would never require people to use Human Waste Bags. This is sick and disgusting. Do you really think people will want to go into the wilderness for a week and carry out their shit with them... Education on the proper disposal of waste is the solution. Human waste does not harm the environment when properly taken care of. Are you planning on monitoring people as they come out and ask them to show you their waste? More control less freedom and less trust.

Comments: I grew up in the San Gabriel National Forest in Southern California. I spent my entire childhood in the forest. I went to Yosemite every summer with my parents and went back packing through the wilderness. I can completely appreciate the intent to keep things natural. But taking away freedom and imposing new restrictions is not in line with what this county was founded upon. The park does not belong to the Government.... it belongs to the people. When I was younger you did not have to have special passes that you put in your car and pay extra money. The wilderness should be free.... We the people already pay enough in taxes. Why give seniors a break, just because they are old? Most of them have retirements and money set aside. How about the younger working people who have

family and want to go to the forest to camp like I did ? How can they afford it? Why should people pay to have the experience of something natural? I was lucky as a child to get to live in the national forest. I got the benefit and understand its value. Nobody should have to pay for taking a walk in the trees and sitting beside a creek to enjoy the sounds of nature. That is a way to connect back to God..if you believe in Him. God is in every thing.. every plan...every rock, and every human being.

I understand that there is a balance between what is in nature and what humans do to destroy that which is natural. Find a balance that does not include more restrictions. The best plan would be to educate people on how to respect nature and what value it has other than just a tree in the forest. Crazy environmental policies do not help at all. The other thing is that Nature can always correct itself. It does not need us. It was around long before we were and will be here when we are gone. The God power is working in Nature and will correct everything itself. It does not need us to meddle in its work. Just leave it alone. Mans big ego makes him think he can fix nature. He will always make it worse because he has an ego and wants to make himself look good.

Maybe manage the park that allows people to experience it, as it is. Do not put more restrictions on people and for heavens sake do not make people do something sick like make them carry out waste in a bag. Be realistic not idealistic. Idealism has no place in Nature. It is for science fiction books and fairy tales.

Correspondence ID:	13	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,18,2014 23:28:50				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I Suggest things be left as they are. No more restrictions or rules for use of the Park is needed.				

Correspondence ID:	14	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,18,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	I recall hiking the Alps, going around a bend, and there was a refreshment stand, complete with a bar, tables and chairs. It was a letdown. It was not a wilderness experience, and drove home to me why many of us so treasure our Olympics and Cascades, and why so many foreign visitors come here for a true wilderness experience.				

I favor leaving cultural resources undisturbed, but if they are threatened by natural processes, let the natural process prevail. I like the idea of having I-person only overnight use permitting. this is a smart move so folks traveling in the wilderness will be told about how to handle their food storage, not to chop down small trees for tent supports (which I have seen), and what to do when confronted by potentially threatening animals.

The majority of the wilderness should be managed for self-directed exploration and self-reliant travel and camping.

I also support efforts to restore ecosystems by actions such as the removal of non-native species, restoration of natural fire regimes and river and stream natural channels.

And finally, I also favor provision and repair of bridges, trails, and footlogs as long as they are done for the protection of, or mitigation of damage to natural resources.

Correspondence ID:	15	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,19,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms. Creachbaum,				

Please find following my comments with regard to the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

The National Park Service's website points out in recounting the origins of the National Park System that when Yosemite Valley was first set aside it was "for public use, resort, and recreation". The Federal law establishing the National Park System mandates that they be "dedicated and set apart . . . as public pleasuring grounds". A balancing of use by people and preservation is mandated by law: to emphasize either to the exclusion of the other would run contrary to the basic principles underlying the National Park System.

1. Olympic National Park was the major reason my family moved here 11 years ago from New York. What motivated us to choose Port Angeles was the ability to access the great natural beauty and diversity of scenery and environments of the Park for recreation.

2. We mainly use Olympic National Park for hiking, snowshoeing and snow boarding (on Hurricane Ridge). We have been on pack trips with horses or mules in other National Parks. These are all activities both appropriate and worth preserving.

3. The main issues in Olympic National Park are preserving and improving public access. Maintenance of, and repairs to, roads, trails, shelters and other visitor facilities have sometimes taken longer than ideal or not occurred at all. Longer ranger led programs to bring visitors further into the heart of the Park also lag what is available at other major National Parks.

4. In the future I would like to see in Olympic National Park:

- well maintained access roads, open year round;
- a full range of snow related activities on Hurricane Ridge in the winter, with advance certainty of being open and sufficient availability of cleared parking for all;
- a well maintained and expanded dirt trail network with safe bridges with handrails where necessary for access into the backcountry;
- additional access points into the Park for hikers at various points around the Park's perimeter.
- a Park culture that is friendly to those who want to use the Park for hiking, overnight camping, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, downhill skiing and snowboarding (on Hurricane Ridge), or horse packing trips (this includes availability of camp sites and reasonable not overly restrictive rules as to campfires and waste management); and
- an expanded ranger led hike program.

The balance between use and preservation in Olympic National Park already has been tilted too far away from use. We have to ensure that the Wilderness Stewardship Plan does not increase that imbalance further. This would be contrary to Federal law.

Additionally, Olympic National Park is extremely important to the economic wellbeing of the surrounding communities, which is closely tied to Park visitation. The Park accounts for the overwhelming majority of the over 3,000 jobs and over \$200 million the region derives every year from tourism. The National Park Service philosophy of civic engagement requires this important fact to be taken into consideration when balancing use and preservation.

As a result, I respectfully request that you adopt "Alternative A", with no further restrictions on Park access and use.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID:	16	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,18,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Park Form				
Correspondence:	1. Blank				
	2. Blank				
	3. Blank				
	4. The road to Obstruction Point and the Deer Park Road are shown on your maps to be in Wilderness. Are they? Does this bear on their maintenance?				

Correspondence ID: 17 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: 1. As a hiker and someone interested in plants I don't like "sharing" (that is being allowed to use what they aren't) trails with horses - have you ever seen a group of horses with a clean up crew following I haven't; trails with heavy stock use are bordered by (mostly) introduced species; riders have never offered me a hand to get back up onto the trail, a few have stopped and waited for me to clear a narrow bit of trail.

2. Blank

3. Delete references to allowing fishing even if it will be allowed until the fish not native to the lakes have been eliminated - we don't need to be making life any harder than we already are for amphibians.

4. Blank

Correspondence ID: 18 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: 1. No. An "Alt E" which has better "use, benefit and enjoyment", which is the purpose of the Nat'l Parks than Alt. A. Not worse!

2. All are worse than Alt. A. Nothing!

3. Better trail maintenance. We have already lost ~400 miles of USFS trails, inherited when the Park was created in 1938. We do not need to lose more. We can reopen trails . . . if this plan does not forbid it.

4. Blank

Correspondence ID: 19 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: 1. Blank

2. Does in-person registration make it difficult for someone from far away to gain access to the interior of the park?

3. Blank

4. Blank

Correspondence ID: 20 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: 1. Where is the Alt. A trail (zone) map? Cannot compare Alt. A baseline with no comparable map of maintained trails.

2. Zoning is useful tool. (Poorly applied in this plan.)

3. Alt. E better trail maintenance and access.

4. Blank

Correspondence ID: 21 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,19,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:

I am writing just a few words expressing my sentiment about the Olympic Wilderness Plans. I have hiked, climbed, and backpacked in the blessed Olympics for many years. I have been a permanent resident of WA since 1984, and now reside in Tacoma.

In principle, I would like the entire Olympic Wilderness area to be as close as possible to the very wilderness explored by the Press Expedition in the late 19th century. To the extent that I know them, Alternatives B, C, & D are reasonable attempts at satisfying this principle.

Mark me down for Alternative C, as I see no role for non-native fish in any lake in the Olympics - other than entertaining humans. This purpose does not seem consistent with the lofty goal of pristine preservation that I consider vital to preserving the Olympic Wilderness for future generations.

Thanks!!!

Correspondence ID: 22 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,19,2014 14:09:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I think so. B and C do not appear to be very different and D provides some change, but I would like to see more options that I will explain below.

Topic Question 2:

I prefer D. As one who has hiked in the outdoors for over 50 years, I treasure most being able to access outdoor regions. I do not favor any plan that decreases existing trails or campsites. I favor a plan that allows more people into the back country. My model is the Alps in Europe. I love the mountain huts, safe water sources and toilet facilities. I think having struck wilderness areas does nothing to benefit the human interaction with our environment. I approve of those areas, but would limit them, particularly near population centers like the Puget Sound.

Topic Question 3:

I do feel human waste is a problem. It is a problem in the Alps. I would go further and add that camp sites (and huts) and composting toilets be added to select routes, such as the Obstruction Point road that could have winter ski camps; the Elwha River Valley up to Low Divide and down to Lake Quinault, and loop trips like the Seven Lakes Basin and Heart Lake path. Controlled access that allows and increases human experience, while reducing impact should be an achievable goal.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 23 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: BCH/ WTRA- VP/ Re/Max-Broker Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Mar,19,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Hello,

I have one area of concern that I would like to address. That is the multi billion dollar horse industry that you have ignored in your plan. We as riders, campers, and stock users need access to these lands also. If you continue to keep us out you will not have access to the thousands of hours donated to the various sites throughout Washington by Back Country Horsemen and the many clubs and associations that use horses and mules.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 24 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,19,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. I propose you adopt a new alternative with twin goals: Maintain wilderness characteristics of those parts of the park currently designated "Wilderness", while at the same time, increase opportunities for people to enjoy wilderness, or near wilderness experiences. The twin objectives are to maintain park wilderness and increase the number of opportunities for people to visit the park.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative A does nothing to discourage visiting the Park.

Topic Question 3:

Adopt a policy to increase visitors to Park wilderness, or near wilderness, while maintaining wilderness characteristics of the park. These are NOT mutually exclusive goals. Many National Parks have adopted strategies to accommodate increased Park visitors while protecting wilderness attributes (for example; Zion National Park, Grand Canyon National Park, Denali National Park, etc.)

Comments: It is a false choice between wilderness OR increased Park visitation. The science of managing use while protecting resources is well developed. Adopting the philosophical value of "preserving lands untouched by man" is not highly correlated with maintaining ecological function of natural systems and scenic beauty. Keeping lands from ANY human impact is a philosophical value, not held by all. The Park is to be enjoyed by ALL Americans, not just those that adhere to a non-scientific philosophy. We can do better.

Correspondence ID: 25 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,20,2014 18:48:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The provided alternatives seem to have the necessary basic elements covered.

Topic Question 2:

I like elements of both Alternatives A and B. Considering that our national parks are supposed to preserve the areas within them for future generations, they both make the most sense. Alternative C, while nice for people like me who are disabled, does not do nearly enough to limit impact of use or restore areas that have been damaged and I am more than willing to give up access in order to preserve one of the greatest natural wonders in the country.

Topic Question 3:

Limited capture and collaring for scientific study of animal species should definitely be allowed. Good wildlife management decisions can not be made without sufficient scientific data.

Comments: Please do all that is possible to help reduce the negative impact human beings have on our Olympic National Park and work to restore areas that may need it. Limiting access to some areas and limiting certain activities may be necessary, though regrettable, but would be worth doing in order to preserve our beautiful national park for future generations.

Invasive/introduced plant and animal species should definitely be removed where they have negatively impacted native species within an ecosystem. However, humane methods should always be used where it is necessary to remove an animal species. Aerial gunning, snares, jaw traps, poison and the like should NEVER be used! If it is necessary, permits to allow hunting of the species to be removed should be issued on a case by case basis. The same goes for management of native species. In regards to populations of native animal species, it would be preferable to use PZP, or other sterilization drugs, to control populations.

Correspondence ID: 26 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,22,2014 19:13:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My main concern is trails. Please do not abandon, remove stock designation, or reduce maintenance standards for any of your trails. Visitor services, of which trails are a key part, are the foundation of a park's legitimacy. Without the ability to use their parks, the public's support will evaporate. Also, and I cannot stress this enough, please do not place any more restrictions on power tool use by your trail crew. Just because it is possible to cut trees with a crosscut saw does not mean you can log out your trails that way and still complete all the work that nature and entropy hand you in a given year. I was a professional trail worker for 8 years with crosscut saws and 12 years with chainsaws, and I can say with absolute certainty that forcing the Olympic trail crew to use crosscut saws will cause severe reductions in both mileage and maintenance standards of your trail system. The need for more labor could cause managers to rely more on volunteers, or to lower wages, both of which will erode the professionalism of your crew and lead to a reduced ability to complete more complex projects. Your draft alternative table says that under all alternatives, trails would continue to be maintained at the frequency established in the 2008 GMP. With all due respect, if you reduce power tool use, this could only be accomplished by either doubling the size of the trail crew or dramatically reducing the quality and quantity of work done with each round of maintenance. Since it is extremely unlikely that the crew will be substantially expanded, it seems obvious that maintenance would suffer. That shouldn't be acceptable. The trail system in this country is an incredibly valuable thing: it allows access to a large segment of society that is unable to bushwack, and it represents the backbreaking labor of generations of people. It is Olympic National Park's responsibility to do whatever it takes to keep their portion of it intact and well maintained. I strongly urge you to adopt alternative D, at least as it pertains to trail maintenance. Thank you for your time and the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 27 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,24,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I like Alternative B. I like that it proposes to fulfill the goal and spirit of the Wilderness Act by reducing human impact and protecting wilderness values.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 28 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Mar,24,2014 09:09:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. The "managing visitor recreation" alternative eliminates 123 miles of existing trail, with Alternatives B and C eliminating even more. The reduction of trails seems short sighted at best for resource protection and is probably counter productive. People need to experience something to want to protect it. It will also lead to more people on the remaining trails, degrading both the wilderness experience in those areas and putting more stress on the

environment.

Requiring quotas for day use is common to all alternatives, which eliminates one of the joys of wilderness which is spontaneous travel without having to deal with an oppressive bureaucracy. Enforcing this will move resources from trail maintenance to law enforcement, which again is the opposite of wilderness.

Eliminating the option of self-issued permits will require scheduling trips around the office hours of the wilderness center as well as the inconvenience of what is most likely an hour delay.

Animal resistant canisters are cumbersome, heavy, and unnecessary with proper alternatives. Any climbing or fast and light trip (often the safest and least destructive method) is hindered by a canister.

Topic Question 2:

Nothing. I find it very difficult to believe that the public scoping to develop these alternatives asked for the elimination of a significant portion of the currently existing trails, and wanted a more heavily regulated wilderness experience. I question the science behind any claim that the existing trail system degrades any resource in any significant way. The letter and spirit of the Wilderness Act does not in any way require eliminating trails. No other wilderness stewardship plan in the NPS or NFS is as restrictive as this suggested plan.

Topic Question 3:

Yes.

Do not eliminate or change the maintenance status of any existing trail. This should be common to all alternatives. There is still a huge portion of the park available outside of maintained trails for those for whom that is an important element of their wilderness experience. Is this being driven by documented harm to any resource or is it driven by a heuristic wilderness ethic? If the former, I would like to see some evidence presented, and I question that elimination of these trails would make a significant difference, and instead will increase the strain on the remaining areas. If the former, why is this anti use ethic prevalent in ONP and not so many other wilderness parks? The existing areas that require animal resistant canisters appears to be adequate...why expand that to the whole park? Self registration at the trailhead should be allowed for all wilderness travel.

Comments: I am very concerned about what appears to be a continuing shift toward a headquarters based management paradigm that resists and actively discourages people-ONP employees as well as the public- from getting their hands dirty and viscerally experiencing wilderness. Our future as a species and planet depend on reconnecting with nature, particularly youth. Showing facebook screen shots of the sunrise at Hurricane Ridge is a feeble substitute for being there and experiencing it with all your senses. Yet the park continues to eliminate opportunities for me to allow my family to use the park for that purpose.

It is difficult to trust the process of public comment when these are the alternatives developed after the preliminary scoping period.

I find it difficult to believe that most (or even any) of the scoping comments said that ONP would be perfect if we just eliminated 20% of those damn trails, and how much better would it be if we eliminated 50% of the trails.

The document itself is difficult to follow distill down to the relevant information. A concise summary such as this would be helpful:

Maintained hiking trails in Wilderness Stewardship preliminary draft plan

Alternative A "No Action" current conditions 629 miles

Alternative B "minimize the human imprint" 394

Alternative C "natural resource protection" 434

Alternative D "managing visitor recreation" 506

Trails to be abandoned (Zones 4 & 5, no longer maintained)

Alternative D "managing visitor recreation": Cascade Rock, Griff Creek, Heart O'the Forest, Elwha Basin, Martin's Lake, Cox Valley, Elk Mountain, Rica Canyon, Geyser Valley, upper Royal Basin, Anderson Moraine, Mt. Hopper, Gladys Divide (Smith Lake), Putvin, Four Stream, Six Ridge, Lake Success, Sundown Lake, South Fork

Skokomish, Wynoochee Pass, Skyline (Kimta-Seattle), Lower Crossing, Sam's River Loop, Upper Crossing, South Snyder-Jackson, Lunch Lake, Cat Basin, North Fork Sol Duc (6 mile ford to shelter), Aurora Ridge (partial), Aurora Creek, Mt. Storm King, Barnes Creek, upper Barnes Creek, Ericson's Bay, Cape Alava-Ozette River: 123 miles.

Alternative C "natural resource protection": all the above plus Lillian River, Dodger Point, Happy Hollow, PJ Lake, Grand Pass, Cedar Lake, Cameron Pass, Lost Basin, Constance Lake, Lost Pass, LaCrosse Basin, Black & White Lakes, Wagonwheel Lake, Upper Lena Lake, Graves Creek, Three Lakes, Skyline (entirety), Elip Creek, South Fork Hoh, High Divide, North Coast, Duk Point Beaches: 195 miles.

Alternative B "reduce the human imprint", all the above plus Constance Pass, LaCrosse Pass, Staircase Rapids Loop, Queets, Rugged Ridge/Indian Pass, Little Divide, North Fork Sol Duc, Aurora Ridge, Happy Lake Ridge, and except Wagonwheel Lake, Upper Lena Lake, High Divide, North Coast, Cape Alava-Ozette River: 235 miles.

Common to all alternatives:

"There will not be an increase in trail mileage maintained. No new trails will be constructed."

"Quotas/use limits will be established for overnight and day use throughout wilderness."

"Wilderness overnight permits will be required and will not be self-issued."

"There will be no self-registration stations within the wilderness area."

"Bear canisters will be required park-wide."

Maintained All-Purpose Trails in Wilderness Stewardship preliminary draft plan

All-purpose trails allow stock access, necessary for maintenance of trail bridges and footlogs.

Alternative A, current conditions: 361 miles (258 miles actually cleared last year)

Alternative B "reduce the human imprint" 250 miles

losses: Wolf Creek, Lillian, Happy Hollow, Grand Valley, Gray Wolf, Cedar Lake, Queets, Little Divide, Mink Lake, Happy Lake, Aurora, Barnes, North Fork Sol Duc: 111 miles.

"Some trails would be shifted to lower classifications with fewer facilities to construct and maintain." "No new bridges, footlogs, or water crossings would be installed. The replacement of bridges, footlogs, or water crossings may occur if determined to be the minimum requirement."

Alternative C "natural resources protection" 184 miles

losses: the above plus: Mt Angeles/Heather Park, Hayden Pass, main fork Dosewallips, High Divide, Sol Duc, Appleton Pass, Olympic Hot Springs, Boulder Lake: 177 miles.

"New or replacement bridges, footlogs, or water crossings may be installed to reduce impacts on the riparian and riverine systems."

Alternative D "managing visitor recreation" 342 miles

losses: above Lake Angeles, Happy Hollow, Cedar Lake, Aurora Ridge (partial), Barnes Creek: 19 miles.

"Assess which trails should have bridges. This may include adding new bridges and/or removing others. Efforts would be made to increase education and awareness about safe methods for water crossings."

Correspondence ID:	29	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	behindmyback.org Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	Mar,24,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

MY COMMENTS ON THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARKS ALTERNATIVE WILDERNESS PLAN

Is this a sufficient range of alternatives? "NO"

I'D BE DELIGHTED TO provide further alternative suggestions.

GET OFF THE D.O.I. "KICK PEOPLE OUT OF THE WILDERNESS PROGRAM" AND MOVE FORWARD

WITH PROVEN WORLD WIDE SOLUTIONS.

INDEED, THERE ARE "CIVILIZED" WORLD WIDE SOLUTIONS THAT PROVIDE SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC INCOME, TOURIST OPPORTUNITIES FOR USE AND ENJOYMENT OF PUBLIC LAND AND PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE WILDERNESS.

WORLD WIDE PUBLIC LAND USE FOR PEOPLE

PROMOTE TOURISM

START WITH FULL USE AND ENJOYMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARK LAND, PUBLIC LAND THAT WAS DESIGNATED BY CONGRESS, SPECIFICALLY FOR THE "PLEASURING GROUND" USE AND ENJOYMENT OF OVER 300 MILLION AMERICAN PEOPLE

PROVIDE USE FOR MIDDLE CLASS WORKING FAMILIES LOCAL AND STATEWIDE (including my 16 grand kids)

PROVIDE USE, FREE ENTRANCE TO THE PARKS FOR LOCAL AND WA STATE FAMILIES

PROVIDE AFFORDABLE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

PROVIDE REASONABLE PRICED FAMILY ACCOMMODATIONS PACKAGES

STOP PROMOTING NATIONAL PARK SWEETHEART DEALS! WOW, ONLY \$225.00 a night and you get a free bottle of booze.

PROMOTE WORKING "FAMILY DEALS"

KEEP THE 1937 PROMISE FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT FOR ALL OF THE CHILDREN AND THE OLD FOLKS TOO

GO AHEAD AND KEEP THE OVER PRICED LAKE CRESCENT LODGE FOR VISITING DIGNITARIES AND FEDERAL BIG SHOTS

PROVIDE INEXPENSIVE FAST FOOD ESTABLISHMENT, THEY MAKE MONEY

PROVIDE ONP FREE OR REDUCED COUPONS IN LOCAL NEWSPAPERS FOR SWIMMING ETC.

UNIVERSAL SOLUTION

BUILD ZIP-LINES THROUGH THE WILDERNESS (A CIVILIZED CONCEPT OF UNTRAMMELED USE) THEY ATTRACT TOURISTS AND THEY THEY MAKE MONEY ALL OVER THE WORLD.

UNIVERSAL SOLUTION

BUILD CABLE CARS AND GONDOLAS LIKE THEY HAVE IN EUROPE (A CIVILIZED CONCEPT OF UNTRAMMELED USE) THEY ATTRACT TOURISTS AND THEY THEY MAKE MONEY ALL OVER THE WORLD.

THESE, UNIVERSAL USER FRIENDLY FACILITIES PROVIDE ACCESS FOR THE HANDICAPPED, ELDERLY, SMALL CHILDREN AND THEY ATTRACT TOURISTS AND THEY MAKE MONEY ALL OVER THE ENTIRE CIVILIZED WORLD.

CREATE AND ALLOW HORSEBACK RIDING, BY THE HOUR, LIKE MINNY PETERSON USED TO HAVE BASED ON SOL DUC PROPERTY ETC.IT ATTRACTED TOURISTS AND IT MADE MONEY.

GET OVER YOU INCREASED QUOTAS AND REDUCED THE COST FOR CAMPING USE AND

ENJOYMENT OF WORKING FAMILIES

ALLOW MORE PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE HIGH COUNTRY (NOT MORE QUOTA RESTRICTED ACCESS)

PROMOTE RUBBER RAFTING CONCESSIONAIRES' ON THE RIVERS (A CIVILIZED CONCEPT OF UNTRAMMELED USE) THEY ATTRACT TOURISTS AND MAKE MONEY IN NATIONAL PARKS IN THE UNITED STATE OF AMERICA

KEEP THE KAYAKER'S AFLOAT, THEY ATTRACT TOURISTS AND MAKE MONEY IN NATIONAL PARKS

HORSES BUILT THE TRAILS

The Back Country Horsemen would be a well organized group to network with in our fight to keep the Park accessible for the public's recreation and enjoyment. Balancing use and preservation does not look like the current iteration offered by the ONP.

Topic Question 2:

I DON'T LIKE ANY OF THEM.

STOP WASTING TAXPAYERS MONEY ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR WILDERNESS PROGRAMMED SOLUTIONS TO FIX A 1964 WILDERNESS PLAN THAT IS NOT BROKEN.

PLAN "A" IS RESTRICTIVE ENOUGH FOR PUBLIC USE AND ENJOYMENT

LEAVE IT AT THAT.

Topic Question 3:

INDEED,

PROMOTE PEOPLE PROMOTE TOURISM

I HAVE BEEN AROUND, THE UNITED STATES IN 48 STATES, 17 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, SOUTH AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN ISLANDS.

THE UNIVERSAL SOLUTIONS ,TOURISTS ATTRACTIONS I MENTION ABOVE, MAKE MONEY, ALL OVER THE ENTIRE WORLD AND THEY WORK!

STOP WASTING TAXPAYERS MONEY ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR WILDERNESS PROGRAMS TO FIX/CHANGE A 1964 WILDERNESS PLAN THAT IS NOT BROKEN.(if the government wants to fix something? fix the trails.)

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR CAN'T TAKE CARE OF THE 875,900 THOUSAND WILDERNESS ACRES IT HAS IN THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK!

THEIR ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS?

LET'S KEEP THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND WORLD WIDE TOURISTS OUT OF THE WILDERNESS?

LET'S CLOSE ALL OF THE ROADS, DESTROY THE SHELTERS, CLOSE AND/OR ELIMINATE THE TRAILS, AND WHATEVER IS LEFT?

AND WHAT IS LEFT?

PLENTY, THE 1964 WILDERNESS PLAN, THE ALTERNATIVE WILDERNESS PLAN THAT IS NOT
BROKEN

IT HAS BEEN IN PLACE FOR 50 YEARS
IT DOES NOT NEED AN "UPDATE", ANYMORE THEN,
THE US CONSTITUTION NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

In accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964, the goal of this wilderness stewardship plan is to restore, protect and
enhance the overall wilderness character of the wilderness area within Olympic National Park"

THERE ARE 875,900 THOUSAND WILDERNESS ACRES IN THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK.

THE BOTTOM LINE ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

GET OFF OF THE WILDERNESS KICK, MOVE FORWARD WITH WORLD WIDE SOLUTIONS, IN THIS
COUNTRY, THE U.S.A, THAT PROVIDE SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC INCOME, TOURIST
OPPORTUNITIES FOR USE AND ENJOYMENT AND PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT.

LEAVE THE 313 MILLION AMERICAN PEOPLE AND WORLD WIDE TOURISTS IN THE ONP
WILDERNESS USE EQUATION.

STOP CREATING MORE RESTRICTED USE AND MORE OPPRESSIVE PUBLIC ENJOYMENT
RESTRICTIONS

PLAN A IS THE ONLY ACCEPTABLE ALTERNATIVE.

behindmyback.org

PEARL RAINS HEWETT

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	30	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Backcountry Horseman of Washington Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	Mar,24,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Park Form				

Correspondence: 1. Not really - Another alternative would be use of the resource balanced with LNT practices (Leave No Trace) - would like to see more stock use. More opportunities for commercial stock packers to provide the recreational experience to visitors and train users in the trade to assist in maintaining the facilities. Not sure of the pack goat concept as goats are browsers and might damage resource due to the concept that the owner does not have to provide feed for this pack animal - what about the introduction of diseases and parasites to the native wildlife?

2. They each had a different emphasis.

3. Alternative D is the best option for use of the resources - provides the most stock trails - provides for pack goats

(whether this is a good or bad idea?)

4. Reintroduction of wolves is a bad idea. There is a reason there are no wolves. Dangerous to stock and users - hikers, backpackers. I don't like the concept of non use as people have been traveling across wilderness areas since our country was established one before we were a country.

Correspondence ID: 31 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: Please consider a few facts before shutting the park down to private use of horses. Research done by the NPS has revealed that damage done to Mt. Rainier NP was over-commercialization: huge parking lots, restrooms, restaurants, hotels, ski lifts, a golf course, campgrounds etc. etc. all WITHIN the park! The Mazamas, the Sierra Club and other big name "environmentalists" were hiring pack strings of up to 100 horses at a time to take them on 2-week camping excursions around the mountain, pasturing horses in the alpine meadows!! (see National Park/City Playground by Catton) When the NPS finally took action to save the park from that over-commercialization, they excluded all horses, including privately owned day-use horses that had committed no offense. When considering horse use, please take care to identify a real problem (with photos and other evidence of the intolerable damage you are attempting to correct) that requires solving, and do not adopt some discriminatory policy based upon over-active imaginations of ignorant extremists. The Olympic N.P. is huge, and cannot be reasonably accessed by the vast majority of citizens only on foot.

Correspondence ID: 32 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,21,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum,

Following are my comments re: the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan:

I strongly urge you to adopt "Alternative 'A' with no further restrictions on access to the Park and use. The Park already has plenty of wilderness areas. According to Wikipedia, "Olympic Wilderness is a 1,370-square-mile 'protected area' comprising over 95% of Olympic National Park. It is the largest wilderness area in Washington.

According to The University of Montana, there are now 876,447 acres of "Wilderness" in the Olympic National Park.

Federal law establishing the National Park System mandates that they be "dedicated and set apart . . . as public pleasuring grounds." The Park Service's logo represents, among other things, "scenic and recreational values", which would indicate that people can come and enjoy the parks.

We currently enjoy a limited ability of accessibility for tourists and locals alike, from hiking to driving in to enjoy the scenery. All of the Alternatives offered except "A" would limit that more than it is already, and would adversely affect the tourism that is one of the few remaining livelihoods available on the Olympic Peninsula: some 3,000-plus jobs and over \$200 million annually derived from tourism.

What is needed are well-maintained access roads, which are open year round; more snow-related activities on and around Hurricane Ridge; and additional access points into the Park, among others.

I urge that the current balance between use by the people and "preservation" be maintained, and that the Wilderness Stewardship Plan remain "as is", as reflected in Alternative "A".

Correspondence ID: 33 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:
Received: Mar,21,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum,

The Olympic National Park and its unlimited opportunities for hiking and nature photography were two top reasons I moved here in 1995 from the Seattle Area. The Park is unsurpassed for the beauty of its natural scenery and its access to trails for all levels of hiking ability.

As a prime tourist attraction, the Park is of paramount importance to the economic wellbeing of Clallam County. Restricting access by increasing focus on restoration (Alternative B) will make it more difficult for many people to enjoy the park.

I believe "Alternative D" offers a workable balance between protecting the natural resources of the Park and providing access to visitors of all interests and physical abilities. The only change I would make with respect to "Alternative D" is to include the requirement for the use of human waste bags in the subalpine areas and above.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Correspondence ID: 34 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,26,2014 13:33:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I appreciate the seriousness of preserving the wilderness character of the Olympic National Park.

Topic Question 3:

Given the size of the Olympic National Park and the limited resources for ranger staffing, having only one alternative make use of online backcountry permitting seems a mistake. A more sophisticated online application could have the same impact on regulating backcountry usage, without the added impact of vehicle emissions driving to a seldomly staffed ranger station in person. Additionally, in-person permitting might restrict usage to those times when ranger stations are fully staffed, thus further concentrating backcountry usage into peak seasons. There might even be a way to pre-qualify backcountry users to access an online registration in order to ensure a full understanding of regulations and personal responsibility.

Comments: I prefer alternative D, which preserves some human footprint while striving for the wilderness experience. As is, Olympic National Park is mostly wilderness. Having some maintained pathways deep into this wilderness helps more people experience the wild. Footbridges, designated backcountry campsites, and privies help organize and manage this experience in a way that is sustainable. Without these accommodations to human traffic, I fear that careless backcountry travelers will have an even greater impact on the wilderness character of the Park.

I love Olympic National Park, and I enjoy the opportunity to continue to explore the backcountry with my young children.

Correspondence ID: 35 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Bremerton Schools Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Mar,26,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative A. To leave things the way they are wilderness areas left alone and roads and trails maintained access for recreational use.

Topic Question 3:

To leave the Parks as they are now.

Comments: The system has worked for years and works for those who use the park and work at the park. If its not broken don't fix it.

Correspondence ID: 36 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,28,2014 12:09:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I much prefer alt D, as does every neighbor and friend I have spoken to.

Topic Question 2:

Wilderness should NOT mean as little human impact as possible. Rather there should be better trails for foot traffic and adequate access so trail length is not impossible. The "absolute wilderness, no sign of humans" folks have had the upper hand for a while and are pushing for unreasonable restrictions.

Topic Question 3:

It is possible for there to be campsites and and even some shelters without damaging the wilderness ethic. Flora, fauna, and humans can co-exist. There is no reason to make believe this park is absolute wilderness, devoid of human presence. A fire pit, showing former human presence, does NOT detract from the wilderness experience. And it does not damage any animal habitat.

Comments:

Spend the money to make the park enjoyable to both day trippers and backpackers.

Repair the access roads and foot bridges.

Save the Chalet in the Enchanted valley.

Rebuild the historical shelters and repair those that need it.

It is possible to keep this park beautiful and pristine without going overboard.

Correspondence ID: 37 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,30,2014 18:08:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
More than enough alternatives, actually.

Topic Question 2:

I like Alternative A, since I greatly enjoy the Park as it is now. I feel that the other alternatives limit human access far too much. Alternatives B - D will make it harder for young and older people to get into the far primitive

campsites that they can now access. If there is a problem with vandalism or individuals negligently degrading the ecosystems, there should be actions against those persons.

Topic Question 3:

Don't plan the park to make it harder for people to use and enjoy it. Maintain the structures, bridges, and trails that are currently in place but don't add more. Don't require backpackers to carry bear vaults everywhere- -maintain the bear wire that is in place now, in the busier, less remote campsites. Don't require backpackers to carry out their human waste in elevations over 3500 feet. Human waste and toilet paper should be buried and will decompose very quickly.

Comments: Although I don't see a place for me to vote for a particular Alternative, I strongly urge you to maintain Alternative A.

I have a great concern that the alternatives B through D will make it difficult for most people to enjoy the Park as they do now. I find these Alternatives discriminate against people with mild disabilities, requiring them to carry more weight and in some cases, having to ford creeks that currently have bridges. By requiring people to carry their own waste, you are restricting the areas over 3,500 feet to people without non-communicable intestinal diseases. Please don't limit access to those who are healthy and in their 20s and 30s.

I currently can still backpack with relative ease but there will be a time in the next ten years that not being able to do so on a maintained trail, while having to carry a bear vault and pack out my own waste, will prevent me from trips into my favorite places in the park.

I am also concerned with these Action Alternatives in that they seem to imply that humans do not belong. Don't we? Do we really want to disconnect nature and humans even further than it is? Shouldn't we have the opportunities that our ancestors had? Yes, education is great but it shouldn't be linked to entry into the park. Limiting visitors by requiring them to reserve days/nights in advance removes any chance of spontaneity- -those with rotating schedules, will suffer.

Also, I am disappointed that this document/process was so very difficult to understand. Much of the items presented were incoherent, vague, and in some places erroneous. Unless you're aiming at a specific group that may have helped design these alternatives, simpler is better.

Correspondence ID:	38	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,26,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms Creachbaum:				

Please accept this as my comments regarding the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

My wife and I chose to raise our family on the northern border of the Olympic National Park so that we could raise our family close to the wilderness that lies within the park. Over the years we have taken our children backpacking, and after they became older, they have gone without us and we have gone on backpacking trips without them. Kim and I enjoy snowshoeing in the winter and our son enjoys snowboarding.

We have taken one extensive trip into the park several years ago and enjoyed it immensely, but the time and energy required to get into the interior of the park is prohibitive in itself. Adding further restrictions and prohibitions is unnecessary.

The park system enjoys a positive public opinion at this time, but the addition of restrictions to its use would cause a negative impact upon that opinion.

I encourage you to adopt alternative "A" to avoid further restrictions toward the use of Olympic National Park.

Correspondence ID: 39 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,28,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum:

In regards to the National Park Wilderness plan alternatives, following are our comments.
Of these choices, we support Alternative A because the other plans are far too restrictive and seem to be in conflict with the current Federal law as the National Park System mandates that the parks be "dedicated and set apart... as public pleasuring grounds". There must be a balance between preservation and public use. The other options are to drastically reduce the numbers of humans who enter for "public pleasuring grounds". There are already rules in place to preserve the wilderness and to restrict the numbers of humans into wilderness areas. There are specific numbers of campsites that one must preregister to stay overnight at, thus limiting the number of occupants.

The economy of the Olympic Peninsula largely depends on tourism, and the other options would be counterproductive to all of the work our local city and civic organizations are doing to promote tourism. So other agencies are promoting tourism and our legislators who want more control of our land are sabotaging these efforts to keep our economy alive.

Human waste bags? Who thought this up? Outrageous!

It would be less costly to keep alternative A than removing all native species of nature and fish. You would have money left to restore trails, foot bridges and outhouses. A well maintained trail would prevent erosion and humans would be more likely to stay on it.

Bear cans are already required, solitude is already enjoyed, and registration and limited uses are already in place. I'm sure the multitude in Seattle and vicinity think your plans are great, not knowing the facts just mentioned.

We sorely regret not being able to attend the public meeting held at the Port Angeles library and would petition to have another one in the near future.

We live in the Olympic National Park and enjoy the few freedoms we have left. Our federal government has gone wild and needs to be reminded that they are employed by "We the people". They are there to enhance our lives not choke us out.

Correspondence ID: 40 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,04,2014 12:40:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: How is it possible the day hiking, backpacking, mountaineering/climbing, ski touring and snowboarding, and kayaking/canoeing can come close to being considered commercial enterprises?

Correspondence ID: 41 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,04,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The posters presented at the preliminary draft WSP public meetings and posted on the PEPC website contain numerous contradictions, errors and omissions identified before and during the public meetings through April 3. Park staff have stated "there is a lot of misinformation out there", and I would add confusion, and it is based entirely on these NPS documents.

I ask that errata or corrected versions be posted on the PEPC website, and the period for public review be reset to the date these corrections are released, and preferably extended to 90 days from the minimum 60 days. As the planning

process will be ongoing for another year or more, this shouldn't delay the overall process. It will allow the Park to clarify, and public to better understand, the preliminary draft alternatives.

In particular, I request the complete list of all Wilderness trails, their mileage and zoning under each draft Alternative, be released. This list, from which the maps were drawn, must already exist, and should have been released on PEPC. The Alternative zoning maps are ineffective because they are simply too difficult to read; the Zone colors are poorly chosen and are not readily distinguishable, particularly where trail segments overlap in areas rich in trails, such as Seven Lakes Basin, the Humes Ranch area and others.

I'm aware that several organizations concerned with recreation are struggling to understand the Alternatives, have a long list of questions, and may formulate suggested changes or additional Alternative(s). Many groups have dozens, in some cases hundreds, of volunteers who have participated in maintenance of specific Park trails or historic structures over the years, and need time to gather input from their members.

It would be far better to promptly correct misinformation or confusion, than to allow it to "fester" for another year! Extending this first preliminary draft would be a positive step in improving understanding, building consensus and getting the entire plan off to a more positive start. It would pave the way to a more productive draft and final plan next year.

Correspondence ID: 42 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Apr,06,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, I vote for A. I'm just got all the rules and areas down. I don't see the need to redo the entire program. The more restrictions the less people will visit in my opinion. There are alot of choices out there.

Topic Question 2:
not much

Topic Question 3:
I don't get the bear canisters for all areas, if this happens I for one will NOT be visiting the park. I avoid those areas now and am grateful for the bear wires still available. Why make it harder for people to go to places? Bear Canisters do NOT fit in packs well, i feel the least the park can do it allow ursacks as well. I also don't get why you would take out the self-registration.

Comments: I like the fact that we all want to save these parks for our future generations, that's the whole point, i get it. Also min. impact on plants, animals etc. But I don't see what is wrong with current program in place? My thoughts are it's working and not broken. I visit the park about 5-10 times a year in one corner or another I hike, backpack, and car camp. I'm about 3 hours from the park.

Correspondence ID: 43 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,08,2014 15:12:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing because I would love too see and hear One Square Inch of Silence. For thousands of years humans experienced this. Silence is gone but it does not have to be. Please support this work.

Sincerely,

Gary Spencer

Correspondence ID: 44 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** Apr,08,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 2:

I appreciate the attention to reducing the use of mechanized equipment.

Topic Question 3:

I would like to see more attention devoted to the soundscape. Truly pristine natural soundscapes are precious and rare, almost to the point of extinction. I would like to be able to visit a place, someday where aviation noise, as well as the noise from motorized vehicles, is banned. It seems that Olympic National Park may bear some hope to become such a place. One of the most important sources to address here may be aviation noise, including that from high altitudes. This may also be one of the most challenging, but well worth the effort.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 45 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Apr,08,2014 17:35:04**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: Since the national park system was formed to set aside large tracts of land dedicated to protecting and preserving the visual aesthetics of pristine landscapes is only follows that the national park system now set aside a portion of land dedicated to protecting and preserving the acoustical aesthetics of pristine soundscapes. It is the next logical step, especially since global noise pollution has virtually wiped out all remaining pristine acoustical environments.

Olympic National Park is uniquely positioned as one of the few national parks on the edge of the continent, so the logistics of establishing such an area is far easier than the national parks located in the interior of the continent.

Obviously, the elimination of all aircraft from this zone would be critical, no matter what time of day and no matter at what altitude they fly. The total elimination of aircraft is absolutely critical.

Cast my vote for becoming the first national park in the world that establishes the first ever pristine soundscape that prohibits all sound from the industrialized world.

Correspondence ID: 46 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Apr,08,2014 18:17:15**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: I support your efforts to provide natural areas free of mechanized sounds including aviation noise at any altitude.

Correspondence ID: 47 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Apr,10,2014 07:34:25**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

Yes.

Topic Question 2:

They are made available to the public for review and comment.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative D seems to be most appropriate and without knowing exactly how the Park will choose to maintain

current facilities, I just think it is important and crucial to maintain access to public places. When a bridge is washed out-replace it. When a building is in danger of being washed away by the changing course of a river-either do something to the building or change the course of the river (EV Chalet). When trailheads are somehow compromised-install or create new temporary trailheads. I'm not sure if Alternative D will ensure actions like this, but I hope so. Thank you.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 48 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,10,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I prefer doing nothing, alternative 1, rather than reducing and restricting access. Perhaps I have not delved deeply enough into your volumes of materials to find why, other than by a perceived or real legal requirement, you propose to remove or fail to maintain existing amenities in the Olympic National Park. Do nothing that makes access and use more difficult for the public for whom the parks exist and are maintained; unless there is documented, significant damage to nature that can be solved by restrictions. Desire to restore to a prior wilderness condition is not a reason to limit public access.

Topic Question 2:

All but the first seem to restrict access in one or another part of the Park.

Topic Question 3:

I do not have sufficient knowledge of details to comment.

Comments: I would do nothing that makes public access more difficult unless that access has produced or very likely will produce significant damage. Simple evidence that others have been there is not damage. Trails are not damage. Maintenance and use of existing facilities is not de facto damaging. Proper back country etiquette does not produce damage and can be required through information and enforcement.

Correspondence ID: 49 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Olympic Park Associates Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Apr,11,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, see comments below.

Topic Question 2:

See comments below.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, see comments below.

Comments: Olympic Park Associates
168 Lost Mountain Lane, Sequim, WA 98382, Ph. 360-681-2480

April 11, 2014.

Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan, Preliminary Draft Alternatives

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

Olympic Park Associates (OPA) commends you and your staff for assembling the groundwork for a sound and visionary stewardship plan for the incomparable Olympic Wilderness. The draft zones and preliminary alternatives offered for public comment represent far-reaching measures that will protect this popular wilderness and its outstanding ecosystems for the coming decades. The draft zones reflect a solid foundation for managing appropriate levels of trail development and visitor use. And excellent options for protecting the Olympic Wilderness can be found in all three proposed action alternatives.

Equally as important, we find the recommendations that are common to all action alternatives (CTAA) to be well thought out and appropriate for a wilderness that is bound to experience increasing demands over the coming decades - - and for an ecosystem that faces unknown threats due to changes in climate and resulting impacts on habitats. OPA supports all of the (CTAA) recommended actions, though we recommend modifications for a few.

Among the actions CTAA we wholeheartedly support:

- *Carrying capacities and quotas will be set for high-use areas.
- *No new trails will be constructed.
- *Trail-less wilderness will be retained.
- *Visitor use will be managed to reduce impacts on native species.
- *Exotic plants and animals will be eliminated or controlled.
- *A restoration plan/EIS for the gray wolf will be developed.
- *Stock use will be regulated and confined to designated trails.
- *No new radio or transmission towers will be installed.
- *Wilderness education will accompany all permits.

A few of the action items could still be fine-tuned, for example:

- *Threatened, endangered and at-risk species will be monitored. We think the plan should recommend that they be recovered and restored.

Overall, OPA endorses an approach that would best protect natural resources and ecological process as displayed in Alternative C, but with the some significant elements taken from Alternative B as well as a few from D.

We agree with the stated emphasis of Alternative B, reduction of the human footprint. This alternative contains the soundest recommendations regarding management of historic structures in wilderness, quotas and use limits, limits on administrative use of aircraft and administrative tool use among others.

We place a higher degree of importance on Alternative C, which emphasizes protection of natural resources and ecological processes. To us, this alternative contains the best recommendations for wilderness trail and campsite zoning (refined with elements from other alternatives as discussed below), trail and bridge management, stock use, and campfire restrictions. It presents the best strategy for protecting ecosystem components and functions into an uncertain future.

Lastly, Alternative D offers some wilderness experiences for visitors that we feel could be accommodated without compromising the management directions of B and C. Ranger-lead interpretive hikes could be increased, tribal access to ethnographic resources could be permitted within the limits of the Wilderness Act, and a few trail zone elements could be adopted without impacting wilderness character or natural resource protection.

Specific recommendations drawn from each of these alternatives follow.

OPA considers Alternative C to present the best strategy for preserving the stunning diversity of natural species and environments that make Olympic National Park what it is. Identifying heavily used nature trails (zone 1) and maintaining popular access trails up river valleys and major passes (zones 2 and 3) will allow for maximum enjoyment of the wilderness while protecting natural resources and wilderness character. The careful delineation of primitive trails (zone 4) and way trails (zone 5), and regulating camping in fragile, alpine and less-heavily used

environments provide sensible limitations on the use of these areas. It is expected that some level of trail maintenance is allowed in zone 4. OPA supports this, of course, but it should be further clarified in the draft plan. Misinformation abounds.

OPA particularly supports zone 4 prescriptions in C, with fewer maintained trails, and zone 5 in C, with no maintained trails. As pressures on back country areas increase, places such as the Skyline trail from 3 Lakes to Low Divide and Martin's Park trail should be zone 4, primitive, and the Bailey Range, Dodger Point high route, Lillian Ridge, upper Royal Basin, Lake Constance, and Lake of the Angels should certainly be placed in zone 5. Boot-worn way trails should suffice.

We also support specific trail zone elements from other alternatives that would increase resource protection yet allow for a modest increase of compatible use on some trails.

To the sound allocations in Alternative C, we would add the following allocations from Alternative B: Shi Shi Beach should be zoned 3, secondary, rather than 2, all-purpose (as in C). This area has experienced serious overuse; the current access trail descends a steep bluff (similar to overland trails on the south coast, which are zoned 3). We believe the old overgrown military road should not be re-opened for trail access, nor should zone 1 or 2-level trail structures be incorporated into the approach trail for Shi Shi. This is arguably the most scenic of ONP's wilderness beaches and one of the easiest of access. Quotas for overnight use should be set and secondary foot trail access maintained.

The North Fork Sol Duc should be zoned 4 and 5, primitive and way trail. This reflects current use level and difficulty of access (a river ford difficult to cross early in season). Visitors desiring more developed wilderness trail access have multiple options just up the Sol Duc Road.

The South Fork Hoh trail should be zone 4, primitive, to preserve one west-side rain forest valley available for a more intimate trail experience free of stock use, developed trail structures and developed campsites. Similarly, the Rugged Ridge trail should be classed as zone 4, primitive, to reflect current use and comply with nearby Hoh-Bogachiel trail zoning.

Aurora Ridge should be zoned 4 and 5 for similar reasons.

From alternative D, we recommend:

Within the following trail zones 2 and 3 we recommend traditional stock use be allowed on the Queets River trail; the Dosewallips/Hayden Pass/Hays River trails; and the Boulder Creek trail (to horse camp/former parking area at Olympic Hot Springs). These would be added to the stock trails already included in alternative C: the Dosewallips/Anderson Pass/Quinault trails; Duckabush/First Divide/Skokomish trails; Elwha/Low Divide/North Fork Quinault trail; Long Ridge and (lower) Lillian trails; the Hoh River trail to Elk Lake, and the Bogachiel/Little Divide/Mink Lake trails. All are well constructed and maintained trails and could be accommodated with minimal impacts to fragile areas. Due to their non-discriminating appetites, "pack goats" should not be allowed in the Olympic Wilderness.

Other Elements of the Plan

OPA endorses other elements of the draft alternatives that are noted below. There are also a few issues we addressed in our scoping letter that still need attention.

Historic structures. We strongly endorse the decision not to consider historic structures to be contributing elements of wilderness character. This clarifies the issue and affirms the clear intent of the Wilderness Act.

The prescriptions for historic management in Alternative B are most in keeping with wilderness principles: no reconstruction of historic buildings that have naturally deteriorated; allowing natural processes to take precedence; and developing a determination of which historic structures and landscapes would be maintained in wilderness. We request that this determination be included in the draft wilderness stewardship plan under NEPA with full public participation and review.

OPA sees an important distinction between Native-maintained coastal prairies, with their associated species diversity, and old homestead clearings, with their exotic grasses. We support careful management of the first, and recommend natural succession for the latter.

Scientific research. The flexibility provided to researchers within the permitting process in alternative C offers the

best approach to managing this important aspect of wilderness.

Park operations. OPA favors the moderate directions in C where park operations would be more reliant on non-mechanized and non-motorized equipment and transport, but with some flexibility in management decisions and applications.

Fire. Alternative B best recognizes the ecological role of fire in the landscape within the constraints of adjacent lands and public safety. We consider hazard fuel reduction activities to protect nonessential buildings in wilderness inappropriate.

Campsites and commercial services. We agree with the approach in C that would retain the number of campsites and the amount of commercial services at about the level same as present. Monitoring is advised. In Washington's other two national parks, commercial reservations have taken up high percentages of use in quota areas.

Bear canisters. There would be educational value in relabeling these animal-proof canisters, so as to not single out the bears. Rodents and raccoons are actually more of a problem in many areas. We understand the desire to require canister use throughout the park, but we suggest a liberal phase-in period during which existing food hanging would be retained in heavily used sites.

Waste management. We recommend continuing use of solar composting privies or other developing technologies in high-use subalpine areas and pack-out bags on Mount Olympus and alpine areas where waste becomes a problem.

Accessible trails. OPA has long supported accessible and interpretive trails in front country. They are equally appropriate in some Zone 1 wilderness areas.

Wilderness District. To insure that these and other measures in the plan receive full consideration in the day-to-day management of the park, OPA once again requests that the plan recommend a wilderness district be created for the Olympic Wilderness, and a wilderness district ranger assigned to oversee all park operations within wilderness.

We wish to thank park planners for the thorough and diligent job they have done thus far in identifying key issues and appropriate management prescriptions. We encourage you to continue in this positive direction to create a stewardship plan worthy of the magnificent Olympic Wilderness.

Sincerely,

Tim McNulty
Vice president
Olympic Park Associates

Correspondence ID:	50	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Noise Free America Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	Apr,11,2014 14:10:14				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the effort to protect the sound scape of Olympic National Park.				

Considering the adverse effect air traffic noise has on all areas in the USA, I strongly support greatly limiting air traffic from encroaching on the pristine quiet of the park.

Correspondence ID:	51	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Gayle & Gordon Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	Apr,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: No, additional alternatives increasing the availability of the park to the public should be proposed				

Topic Question 2:

I do not like any of the alternatives except plan A, which leaves the park as existing and supports the current use level

Topic Question 3:

I specifically object to the concept of elite access that is progressively more restrictive in each proposal. Locking up all nature so only a few can have access is not what the park system was established to do.

Comments: The NPS appears to be working toward a restricted area concept, where only a privileged few are licensed to enjoy the park on a very restricted schedule that is pre-approved and very limited in area.

Correspondence ID: 52 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,15,2014 20:59:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, I believe this is a sufficient range of alternatives as it helps to focus attention on a range of priorities.

Topic Question 2:

I like that the alternatives offer a spectrum of priorities from increased visitation to protection.

Topic Question 3:

I believe the reintroduction of extirpated species should be included in all of the potential alternatives.

Comments: I feel that Alternative C is the most appropriate alternative to guide the management of Olympic National Park's wilderness. As a world heritage site, Olympic has been internationally recognized for its unique natural heritage. Therefore, the prioritization of natural resource protection and rehabilitation is the best use of the park's wilderness.

Reintroducing extirpated species, removal of invasives (including the goats and introduced trout) and rehabilitation of damaged natural processes will enhance and restore the Olympic ecosystem.

Alternative C allows for these activities while providing recreational opportunity for those willing to encounter wilderness. I commend the park service for recognizing the wilderness's unique natural value and urge the selection of Alternative C as the preferred approach.

Sincerely,
Brett Baumann

Correspondence ID: 53 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,16,2014 17:32:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Overall, yes, this is a sufficient range. However, there are some modifications that I have suggested in the general comments section.

Topic Question 2:

See general comments.

Topic Question 3:

See general comments.

Comments: Permits - Would like to see some self-registration still available at remote trailheads. It is a real drag to take away all of the spontaneity from a quick weekend trip. I guess that people from urban areas are used to planning ahead and getting permits ahead of time, but a lot of rural folks aren't quite there yet.

I need to make a general comment about permits. I understand the necessity, especially for overnight backcountry use. But I really do not like having to pay for general access to public lands, with the exception of developed areas such as Hurricane Ridge and the Hoh. Kudos to Olympic National Park for not requiring something like the Forest Pass that is required simply for parking at a National Forest Trailhead even to go hiking for an hour or to eat your lunch. Or the Discovery Pass which is required just to access State lands. Those passes are totally unreasonable in my book, and quite frankly it has led me to quit using Forest Service trails for day hikes (the only reason I have a Discovery Pass is because I hunt and fish, otherwise I would forego that as well). Basic access to undeveloped (not including a basic parking area and trail) public lands should be covered by my taxes. I do not begrudge paying an additional fee for access to a developed area with services, facilities, programs, etc., although I would rather just pay a bit more tax up front than to get nicked and dined at the gate or have to buy special passes. I apologize for the rant, but again, I'm glad that most trailheads in the park are still free.

Quotas and use limits - I like the group size limit of 6 in zones 4-6; this should apply to all alternatives, not just B and C.

Food storage - I like the bear canister requirement in all alternatives.

Waste management - Human waste bags should be a possibility under Alternative D as well (it is unclear if they are). There are too many local variables to make generalized requirements such as "all areas above 3,500 feet". All options should be available to managers. Visitor education must be increased! Far too many visitors dispose of their waste improperly. Lake Angeles is a high-use area that has a serious human waste problem. A fly-out vault system is needed there, or some other alternative. The current management strategy at that site is not working and is creating a health hazard. If human waste bags are required (or even recommended) they should be available for purchase at ALL locations where permits are obtained.

Campfire restrictions - I think the restrictions proposed in Alternative B should be applied to all alternatives, although I don't think a ban on campfires in the coastal strip is manageable. Many coastal visitors, especially at the easily-accessed sites (such as Norwegian Memorial via the short-cut trail, Sand Point, Cape Alava, etc.) have a strong desire to have a beach fire as part of their experience. A complete ban in the entire coastal strip would be difficult to enforce, and a regulation that is not enforced and willfully disregarded is worse than no regulation at all.

Signs and other route markings - I would like to see signs used more effectively at Wilderness campsites and destinations. The use of signs should be carefully evaluated, and they should be made as unobtrusive as possible while still meeting their objectives. Signs in Wilderness should primarily be used to protect park resources. At some camp areas I think it would be effective to remind visitors to "camp only in designated sites" or that fires are not permitted. Some visitors, especially local visitors out for short weekend trips to high-use areas, simply need to be reminded at the site since they probably didn't read the trailhead information. Signs should be considered temporary and used strictly to meet specific management objectives. Directional signs should not be used unless there is resource damage occurring as a result of lack of signage.

Hiking trails/access - The coastal shortcut trails, especially the one to Norwegian Memorial, need to be addressed specifically. Whether the park wants to acknowledge it or not, the Norwegian shortcut is the way that many, if not the majority of, visitors access that site. The short distance, lack of any park information at the trailhead and lack of ranger patrols all contribute to it being a "maximum impact" camping area. The shortcut trail is well-advertised on the internet and is definitely well-known and heavily-used by locals. Even if visitors do realize that they are entering a national park (although it would be very easy to not realize it), the lack of an official trailhead only adds to an atmosphere of lawlessness. Park managers need to acknowledge that a significant part of the visitor use at Norwegian comes from people that have not hiked in from Ozette or Rialto and are thus ensconced in the wilderness; they've come in on the shortcut trail and are out there to party and run their dogs, unimpeded by park management. Sorry about my rant on the shortcut trail to Norwegian, but it needs to be addressed.

Stock trails/access - I know stock users have a powerful lobby, but they are a vociferous minority. The amount of

stock use in the park relative to total backcountry use is tiny, probably less than one percent. It seems that a lot of money gets spent on bridges and other facilities for stock that receive extremely low amounts of stock use. Also, it seems that the Extent Necessary Determination may further reduce stock use in the park, since a fair amount of the stock use is probably by commercial outfitters. Anyway, I would like to see the level of stock trails/access described for Alternative C also applied to Alternative D.

Wilderness trailhead exhibits - First of all, see my comments above about the shortcut trails. Some kind of trailhead (or at the park boundary; but it would be better to work with Rayonier to have information at the trailhead) information is needed to inform, educate and/or remind visitors about entering the park and Wilderness.

Secondly, it seems that a new approach is needed at the high-volume day-use areas, such as Sol Duc Falls. It is somewhat unfortunate that sites such as Sol Duc Falls were included within the Wilderness boundary at all, but I know that cannot be changed. The problem I see is that many (if not most) visitors to places like Sol Duc Falls really are not out for a "wilderness" experience. It looks, sounds, smells and feels like a frontcountry site, and in most other parks it would be. Just seeing the large number of "RV pets" that get walked up to Sol Duc Falls (and rangers ticketing people for it) is an indication of two things: 1) the expectation of the visitors does not match the management goals; 2) the visitors are not effectively getting the message at the trailhead. I think a lot of those visitors are not maliciously flaunting the rules; they just don't know.

Trailhead information dissemination is tough. A significant number of visitors don't read the trailhead information; they're in a hurry to see the beautiful park. I don't know what the solution is, but you've got to give visitors a reasonable chance to get the information you want them to have.

Wilderness ranger stations and associated structures - I don't mind having ranger station cabins in the Wilderness, as long as they at least "look" historic. I think the old ranger stations add to the wilderness character, as long as there aren't too many of them. The current amount of backcountry ranger cabins seems okay, and they should be repaired or replaced as needed while maintaining their historic appearance. I think this should apply across all of the Alternatives.

Waste management - all options should be available in all Alternatives, with the over-arching goal of reducing helicopter flights. A systematic monitoring program should be implemented in all Alternatives to monitor human waste issues (i.e. improper disposal) at high use areas, especially those with no toilet facilities (such as Lake Angeles).

Marine debris - Why only focus on "larger marine debris"? All of the smaller garbage out there (e.g. plastic bottles, pieces of styrofoam, etc.) "threatens the natural, undeveloped, and opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined types of recreation qualities of wilderness character". The huge amounts of small debris that are out there have a greater impact on my wilderness experience than one derelict dock or boat. Why is the coastal Wilderness being treated differently than the rest of the Wilderness in this regard? If any other hiking route in the park were strewn with garbage like the coast is, it would be cleaned up immediately. While it is not reasonable to try to keep the coast entirely clean, the park needs to make a much more concerted effort in terms of facilitating marine debris removal. There are lots of people who will volunteer to pick the stuff up if the park would do more to facilitate its removal. Both small boats and helicopters should be used as needed to remove debris that has been cached at designated sites.

Aircraft use - I like the Alternatives in this regard. My only comment concerns commercial jet traffic over the park. There are times when the sound of jets is nearly constant; before the sound from one completely fades away you hear the next one coming. It would be interesting to see the result of the sound monitoring that was done, especially regarding commercial jets. If at all possible, the park needs to ramp up its effort to protect the airspace above the park. I realize that is a tall order, but the Olympic Wilderness is one of the most pristine in the lower 48 and deserves better protection in terms of soundscape.

Correspondence ID:	54	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Little Family of Port Angeles Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	Apr,18,2014 19:42:57				

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The information available on the website offers too many offerings, making the evaluation of options difficult and confusing. A consolidation of information would be helpful. Regarding the "alternatives" (A, B, C, D), YES, a wide range of options are available under the guise of the 'Wilderness Act' (originally intended for USFS land not NPS).

Topic Question 2:

There are ultimately TWO alternatives: Continue as is, or reduce access to the 'Olympic Wilderness' (or, at least that is my interpretation of the information provided on this website). I am AGAINST REDUCED ACCESS. The Wilderness Act PROTECTS the environment 'as is' while providing ACCESS. A environment that limits access therefore goes counter to the intent of the wilderness act. Access to trailheads must be maintained. To not do so LIMITS access and therefore REDUCES access.

Topic Question 3:

If confusion is the 'goal' then that goal has been met. So, it is likely that when an opinion is given for Option A, B, C, or D it is done with an intent of one thing, but by voicing a support for the option, the result is that the incorrect option was selected.

Comments: The USFS walks the delicate balancing act of recreational access vs. industry (timber harvesting). In our nation public land has been set aside for railroads, mining, lumber harvesting. The NPS is the place for the higher ideals of President Teddy Roosevelt and the first Chief Forester of the USFS, Gifford Pinchot. These insightful, unselfish men, set aside vast, beautiful portions of the nation for our people to enjoy. Not only the wealthy had access, but all who wished to go there do. The insightful Wilderness Act of 1964 protected special pockets of this land by preventing mechanized vehicles (I am a mountain biker, but I gladly forego my bicycle to enjoy the trails of Olympic) to impact these pristine areas. Exceptions were made: For instance 'definition of mechanized vehicles' as in paddles and canoes in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area of Northern Minnesota. Is a paddle a form of mechanization? In the NPS a balance between wilderness (even in areas void of the designation such as Yellowstone NP and Glacier NP where 93% of the park is designated as wilderness and is managed as such even though there is NO OFFICIAL DESIGNATION as wilderness). "Official" designation isn't needed for the natural environment to be protected. Olympic is a GEM. An absolute JEWEL in the National Park System. We are so FORTUNATE to have this park in our backyard. My wife and I moved our family to this area largely due to ready ACCESS to the Park's three ecosystems. The park as is, provides access to the beaches, the rain forest and the mountains. Implementation of Plans B, C, or even D seem to LIMIT this access and go counter to the intent of President Roosevelt's vision. Adherence to the Wilderness Act of 1964 already protects the wondrous natural environment that is our beloved Olympic National Park. Consequently, I support "Alternative A" and oppose ALL of the three other alternatives. Best wishes in providing continued support for ACCESS to BEAUTIFUL Olympic NP.

Correspondence ID: 55 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,19,2014 17:13:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe alternative D to be the most reasonable to start with (since A will not continue). More restrictive alternatives can be reviewed in the future as a next step in the process of the wilderness plan. I am trusting that the permit process will allow for those without email access or cellphone (e.g. while away from home, on vacation, in a remote location with no service) and/or after hours when park offices are closed.

Correspondence ID: 56 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Pvt. citizen and Great Old Broads for Wilderness Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Apr,22,2014 14:41:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

I like that two of them will actually attempt to save this amazing wilderness and its natural resources, rather than allowing an ever-encroaching human population to ruin it.

Topic Question 3:

I don't agree with allowing any additional human visitor impact and do not support alternative D.

Comments: I definitely favor alternatives B and/or C.

Correspondence ID: 57 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,24,2014 13:41:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Zone 2s or Zone 3s strike the best balance. I'm not real supportive of riding stock in the Olympics because of the overall impact of horses. However, my experience shows that pack horses represent a small percentage of overall usage.

Comments: I would like to add my voice to those who want the Dosewallips River road to be left as is. Allowing bike accessibility is a nice alternative. Trying to re-create a new road up to the old camp ground is going to cause a major scarring of the landscape that is healing nicely.

I belong to a family group that has been going up the Dose for several generations. The national park campground at the top is nice for vehicle style camping. However, I've also experienced theft, unsafe road driving, and load parties due to easy human influence because of the road access.

The Dose has never been more beautiful. Rebuilding the road will re-open the upper camp ground to a car camping mentality and the consequent negative effect of this activity.

Please leave the Dose alone to heal.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 58 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,24,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

These all unrealistically presume that less access will allow a purer experience of wilderness, but for .0001% of the population. Sorry, but very autocratic and self-defeating of declared principles. People will have ever greater alienation from the wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

They were sincerely and diligently developed in a very difficult public environment by a very dedicated group of specialists. Sustainability always requires an overview of clear intentions and that environment.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, sequestering the wilderness to protect it is like locking a teenager in a room until they turn 20 for their own protection.

Nice idea, born of love, but doomed to fail and generate misery and animosity for a lifetime.

Who will protect the wilderness in 20 years?

Comments: I believe Port Commissioner Calhoun(PDN 4/24/14) has it exactly right:

"The purpose of wilderness is to enrich the human experience and provide that fantastic opportunity we have in this county with our wilderness areas and allow individuals to experience our wilderness, and I don't see that in the planning objectives for implementing the wilderness plan,"

Without experience and understanding of wilderness, support for the park will surely wane and then the wilderness will be vulnerable to far greater fiscal dangers.

Inclusion of more people in the wilderness experience holds far more hope for sustaining wilderness, then putting higher barriers to its experience around it.

A renewed and strengthened understanding will lead to a far greater common good being realized from what was always intended to be a preserve and park. Thus the designation of the "National Park Service".

Most trails in our park are routes to transit end to end, perhaps somewhere there could be a web of trails, that explore wilderness at many scales with alternate routes yielding 1 mile to 25 mile wanderings back and forth in the same smaller area. There is already intense interest in this kind of experience demonstrated in the Elwha Valley and Seven Lakes Basin.

Morse Creek basin with a dozen intertwined trails and no camping would be an example. It would reduce human impact with no camping and a carry out every thing that went in policy, but allow constantly varying paths around the basin to be experienced through the seasons.

Let people really get to know the wilderness like a park ranger does, rather than simply peek in at it while in transit. An access ring of Deer Park road, Grand Ridge Trail, Obstruction Point road and the Hurricane Ridge road already exists, Cox valley trail exists, fill in the web. Teach about water sheds, ecologies, plant and forest growth decay and natural accession.

Make a difference in people lives with wilderness, not a wilderness museum (a last place to see under glass and guard).

Keith Harrington

Correspondence ID:	59	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	NPS - Zion National Park Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	Apr,24,2014 15:50:57				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, I think this is a sufficient range of alternatives. I think if you were to pick one alternative and not change it, though, it would end up being unpopular. I think the correct course of action from here was to look at public comments and come up with one alternative that would give maximum protection and one that would give minimum protection that the park service could live with and then see what the public has to say.

Topic Question 2:

Alt. B - 1. "Human waste bags would be encouraged for all wilderness users"

2. "The majority of the wilderness would be managed for self-directed exploration and self-reliant travel and camping."

3. "Self-registration stations within the wilderness area would no longer." be provided.

4. "Quotas/use limits would be established for overnight use throughout the wilderness, as well as for day use in high use areas."

5. "All management activities would be conducted in a manner that minimizes the imprint of modern humans within wilderness. Under this alternative, park operations would be more greatly reliant on non-mechanized equipment and transport with the goal to reduce the number of administrative structures, installations, and the use of mechanized equipment and transport"

Alt C. - 6. "Healthy ecosystems would be restored and maintained through the implementation of appropriate

management actions (such as the removal of non-native species, reintroduction of extirpated species, restoration of natural fire regimes, and channel migration). Under this alternative, park management would seek to remove non-native fish species in wilderness rivers and lakes."

7. "Self-registration stations within the wilderness area would no longer be provided. Quotas/use limits could be established for overnight and day use throughout the wilderness."

8. "Under this alternative, park operations would be more reliant on non-mechanized equipment and transport with the goal to reduce the number of administrative structures, installations, and the use of mechanized equipment and transport"

Alt. D - 9. "All cultural resources, including historic structures and cultural landscapes, would remain protected to the extent practicable and feasible."

10. "Current facilities such as designated campsites and camping areas, bridges, trails, and privies would continue to be provided."

11. "Self-registration stations within the wilderness area would no longer be provided."

12. "Quotas/use limits would be established for overnight and day use throughout the wilderness."

Topic Question 3:

Alt. B - 1. "Cultural resources would remain largely undisturbed and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes would prevail." This is too vague for me. What does that mean? Like shelters, bridges, signs, etc... How will this be determined?

2. "the intent that the overall human imprint would be reduced" This statement may just take the whole WSP down with it. With phrases that are exclusionary like this, you will lose your public support. The point should be to provide a better experience for the public, not to keep people out.

3. "Bear cans would be required for all wilderness users." Since this is in all three of them, I think that I have no choice. I think hanging food would be sufficient. Where is the documented evidence that bear cans are better than hanging your food?

4. "This alternative would consider an in-person only overnight use permitting process, with an educational component." Why suggest an online program in Alt D and then have an in person only component in Alt B and C. What about a combo?

ALT C 5. "Facilities (such as bridges, trails, footlogs, etc.) may be provided mainly for the protection of, or mitigation of damage to, natural resources." Don't like this. You need people in wilderness. They are a part of it. You take away the ability to put people there and you will be diminishing the wilderness character. Olympic needs good bridges, trails, footlogs, etc... to allow people to access these places.

6. "Human waste bags would be required in the subalpine and above." I would change the wording of required to given out for those camping in the subalpine and above. A good idea, but if you require it, you may get more backlash than if it is provided. Those who still can properly dispose of human waste should be allowed to do so.

ALT D 7. "park management would continue to promote sport-fishing consistent with other wilderness values of the high mountain lakes." I don't know if you need to promote anything, especially sport-fishing. I think allowing fishing is okay, but I am not sure what promote means.

8. "This alternative would consider an online only permitting process with an educational component for overnight use." - Online only would be a disaster. Online option would be a positive.

9. "This alternative would also consider the use of pack goats" - Exclude people, but add goats. Hmm, doesn't make sense to me at all. I would not want pack goats in the wilderness.

Comments: I grew up in Washington State and still continue to return to recreate within Olympic National Park.

Last year, I did a five day trip through the Bailey Range and found it to be some of the best preserved wilderness in the United States. I currently work in wilderness as a Backcountry Visitor Assistant at Zion National Park. I fully support the idea of a Wilderness Stewardship Plan and hope that you are successful implementing one.

In the suggested alternatives I find some large, gaping holes, though. The first of these is your zoning. There are far too many zones. At Zion, we have 3 zones within wilderness. Primitive, Pristine, and Research Natural Areas. Only two of these allow for visitor use. Primitive allows for more visitors, pristine allows for less visitors. The public has close to a 0% understanding of how we choose to manage these areas. You put 6 zones in there and try to explain to someone that they can do this because they are in zone 4 but not in zone 5. They are not going to understand that. Simplify your zones to make them somewhat more relevant.

My largest problem is that in all alternatives, there is this idea of limiting due to quotas. But you don't tell anyone how you are going to make those decisions. That is about 50% of our Wilderness Management Plan. That needs to be made known to the public.

Also to go along with that, there is absolutely nothing about monitoring in here. It seems like all decisions will be made arbitrarily by park managers. This could spell disaster in many levels later on. Have a standard that you want to meet, clearly state how you will monitor that, clearly define what happens when you don't meet that, and you will have more success.

I expect there to be a lot of public backlash to this plan because there is so much that is vague. In Zion, our main goal was to get scientific data to back our use limits. We have a leg to stand on all the time because through surveying, the public showed that they supported use limits for a variety of reasons. This was and is a big deal that whenever someone asks why they can't go someplace, we tell them that the public asked for these places to be limited. If it comes just from the park, you will never find public support. They will just see it as the government telling them what to do.

Hopefully this helps. Feel free to contact me if you need anymore input from how things have been successful and failed here at Zion. Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 60 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,24,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammelled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

There are some good elements to the preliminary alternatives. Unlike in the past, the NPS is not planning to maintain unneeded structures under the ruse of historic preservation. In most alternatives, there is a commitment to reduce Park Service reliance on motorized and mechanized transport as well as to avoid building new structures for wilderness administration. Also, most of the alternatives have measures to eliminate overuse.

Topic Question 3:

Disallow vehicle use as much as possible and remove the false "historic" illegally built lookout.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 61 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,24,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, the alternatives sound reasonable and balanced...especially reducing "the human imprint" on wilderness areas... if there are already 40,000 overnight visitors to the Park every year - how many more do the critics (i.e. the inept Port Commissioners want?). The designation "wilderness" seems antithetical to tourist saturation. (Who's been to Costa Rica recently?)

Topic Question 2:

The wilderness is to be protected.... not "managed".... we are indeed stewards and I believe the Park employees are dedicated to this end....I am not certain that the Port Commissioners (who plan to clear cut Lincoln Park) are disinterested voices who should be heeded in any way about exploiting the commercial features of the Park.

Topic Question 3:

Enhance "provide more opportunities for solitude due to managing visitors strategies for resource protection."

Comments: It's truly democratic to invite public comments - but I believe that some Port Angeles area residents have a sort of schizoid relationship with the wilderness - still a hangover from the Big Timber Days - I think the views of the commercial enterprises here should have far less an impact on the Park's future than comments from those who are deeply committed and understand the essence of how to keep this Wilderness protected as one of the last pristine places in our nation.

Correspondence ID: 62 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
More alternatives are needed.

Topic Question 2:
We need one that emphasizes untrammled Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:
As above.

Comments: None further.

Correspondence ID: 63 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

no when the agency picks the alternatives, it is always what the employees want. it's never what the public wants. the general public never has much of a voice because nepa requirements for broad outreach are never enforced. never. you mail comment requests to your pals who will do what you want. you trade favors with other agencies.

Topic Question 2:
i agree with the wilderness society and their solution.

Topic Question 3:
i want all wildlife murderous hunting banned. i want prescribed burns banned. i want logging banned. i want roads banned. i want wilderness to be a priority. complete wilderness.

Comments: i agree with the comments of the wilderness society. i favor wilderness. we have little enough of it. i want the perverted psychotic fans of the nra killing society who kill wildlife, birds/ everything to be banned from the entire site.

Correspondence ID: 64 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Comments: The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 65 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
no

Topic Question 2:
they don't go far enough

Topic Question 3:
The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Comments: The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 66 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
no

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 67 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,26,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:
NO MORE LETTING THE GREEDY, PSYCHOPATHIC FOSSIL FUEL INDUSTRY DESTROY THE PLANET
JUST TO GET EVEN RICHER! FOSSIL FUELS = DEATH!!

Correspondence ID: 68 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,27,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
B is the best option to keep wilderness as such and minimize human activities

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 69 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,27,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

It is good that the NPS is not planning to maintain unneeded structures under the ruse of historic preservation. Also good: In most alternatives, there is a commitment to reduce Park Service reliance on motorized and mechanized transport as well as to avoid building new structures for wilderness administration. Also, most of the alternatives have measures to eliminate overuse.

Topic Question 3:

Add these points to any alternatives where they are lacking: There should be a commitment to reduce Park Service reliance on motorized and mechanized transport as well as to avoid building new structures for wilderness administration. Each alternative should have measures to eliminate overuse.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 70 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,28,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

1. That the NPS is not planning to maintain unneeded structures under the ruse of historic preservation.
2. There is a commitment to reduce Park Service reliance on motorized and mechanized transport.
3. There is a commitment to avoid building new structures for wilderness administration.
4. Most of the alternatives have measures to eliminate overuse.

Comments: The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness. Nature should be allowed to take its course through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 71 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,24,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: I am writing in regards to the Port of Port Angeles' complete failure to understand the Wilderness Act, and the Wilderness Planning Process.

The Port Commissioners have facetiously conflated general park access (and visitors) with wilderness access (and visitors) and arrived at a completely erroneous conclusion.

Olympic National Park experiences millions of visitors yearly, only a few percentage of which are wilderness visitors.

Well over 95% of ONP visitors will be completely unaffected by any changes to the Park's wilderness plan.

The changes that the commissioners call for - increasing visitor access and experience - appropriately belong in the front country - at resources such as the Hurricane Ridge visitor center, and the Hoh rainforest interpretive trail, and at Kalaloch Beach, for example.

Indeed, users of the Olympic wilderness are self-limiting: Those individuals who choose to step beyond the end of the road for one or more nights spent in the wilderness. Nothing in the wilderness plan will ever deny an individual the right to spend the night in the wilderness. It may restrict where and how they may spend that night, but they will still get their wilderness experience.

Overall tourism will be completely unaffected by any wilderness plan.

In conclusion, I would like to destroy Commissioner Calhoun's facetious argument that quote 'The purpose of wilderness is to enrich the human experience'

Quoting The Wilderness Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-577), which states to the contrary that:

"A wilderness...is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.

The Port of Port Angeles' argument is without merit, reflects complete ignorance of what wilderness is, how it is used and by whom, and its legal status.

Correspondence ID:	72	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Apr,01,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Park Form				
Correspondence:	1. No, we need an "E" that builds more trails and makes it easier for low income families to hike in the park.				

2. Nothing

3. Keep self registration, don't force online registration, not everyone has a computer or internet or a printer.

4. Bear cans are heavy and don't fit well in packs. Only require them in areas with problem bears. A bus up Hurricane Ridge, more bus service in the Park.

Correspondence ID:	73	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	OPA and Great Old Broads Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	Apr,01,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Park Form				
Correspondence:	1. YES - Very good job!				

2. I like B & C. I'd like to protect Wilderness and am fine with letting natural processes do their work. I don't particularly want more trails or "improvements" - I've been on wild & scenic rivers and in where wilderness permits must be applied for - I want this kind of protection for ONP - and carrying all waste out - people become adjusted to these new requirements quickly. It seems even more important to protect the wilderness with threats of fire and threats to animals re: climate. Also, budget is stretched - I think B & C will not add to budget burdens - ??.

3. Blank

4. Good leadership on this!! I'd hope for B or C. Leaning toward B.

Correspondence ID:	74	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	BCHW Unaffiliated Individual				

Affiliation: Member
Received: Apr,01,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: 1. Yes

2. They are very broad - but in this is a serious element of confusion -

3. Yes - in several stock (horses & mules) are going to be reduced or eliminated from access. - This has led to secure very uncomfortable press and PR - since the Grand Canyon business National parks are on the radiator.

4. I am in favor of option #A - it is not broken the wilderness is in tack and healthy. It allows for reasonable maintenance with power tools and access for all. - why change what is not broken!

Correspondence ID: 75 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,01,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Ms. Creachbaum, my wife and I have spent many months hiking and camping in Olympic National Park. We have hiked the ocean beaches and most of the river valleys to the high country. We do not claim to have hiked all the trails within the Park, but we certainly have hiked many of them.

We have reviewed the four alternatives the Park employees are considering. By far, my preferred option is Alternative D. My reasoning is that it provides the greatest options to providing access to the interior of the Park. It maintains or replaces existing facilities. It seems to me that it is important to the existence of the Park, that the citizens be permitted access to the park if they are to support it. Simply observing the park from afar will not generate support.

Correspondence ID: 76 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,01,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sup. Creachbaum:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for Olympic National Park. I attended the public meeting in Port Angeles on March 18, 2014 and reviewed the plans at that time.

I have been hiking in the ONP backcountry since the mid 1960's. I still make several overnight trips each year, numerous day trips, and hope to continue doing so for years to come. When I took the time to highlight all of the ONP trails I have hiked I came to realize that there are only a few established trails in the Duckabush, Skokomish and Queets drainages that I have never hiked. I am completely comfortable hiking alone, carrying with me all the necessary gear and supplies, including the well-known 10 essentials for survival. However, the one limiting factor that determines routes I chose is a trail that is maintained to the extent that I can hike it safely. When I hike solo I stay on better maintained and more traveled trails. When I hike with a companion I may choose tougher trails with no expectation of seeing anyone else.

In all my years and miles of hiking in ONP, once I have traveled 3-5 miles from a trailhead I have often met no other hikers. There are exceptions, of course, such as Seven Lakes Basin. But in truth, the ONP wilderness is not crowded or over-used.

1. Is this a sufficient range of alternatives? If not, please provide further suggestions. The descriptions and maps of the alternatives suggest that the No Action Alternative will not be considered. This is a shortcoming of the public review and decision process and should be corrected.

2. What do you like about the alternatives? Alternative D seems to be the closest to the current management of the

wilderness areas. I like the suggested maintenance levels of the trails, and believe that Alternative D will provide the most opportunities to enjoy the heart of ONP. I like the on-line permitting process (assuming this means for overnight use, not day use). However, there should be an opportunity for in-person permitting.

3. Are there specific elements you feel should be changed? If yes, how would you change them? Alternatives B and C both seek to reduce human use of the wilderness areas. This contradicts at least one purpose of ONP, that is, providing opportunities for humans to enjoy the natural environment, not just from a scenic outlook such as Hurricane Ridge, but intimately, by hiking SAFELY into the backcountry. Bridges crossing the swiftly-flowing, cold ONP streams should be maintained. With the exception of several well-traveled areas, e.g. Seven Lakes Basin, it is not necessary to require human body-waste to be packed out. Proper burying or use of privies and other facilities can manage body waste without impact to the wilderness environment.

4. Please share any additional comments or suggestions. Maintaining multiple trail options provides ONP hikers with options that will serve to disperse their use. Dispersal will reduce the impact on otherwise more popular areas that would become overcrowded if they become the only good trails to hike. Existing trails, bridges and shelters provide the opportunity to safely enjoy the beauty of the ONP wilderness backcountry. Alternative D or the No Action Alternative should be adopted.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan. I look forward to this upcoming season of hiking. Please include me on your mailing list.

Correspondence ID:	77	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Mar,31,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

I am a resident of Port Angeles area who thinks the ONP is the best reason for living here and who just finished reading the Wilderness Stewardship Plan Preliminary Draft Alternatives. For the "uninitiated" like myself it was a challenging read but I was impressed by the amount of time and thought that went into developing the four alternatives.

Generally I favor Alternative B as it appears to reduce the use of motorized vehicles and equipment, fly-overs, man-made structures and stock trails and facilities. I would prefer that the final strategy encompasses the Page 1 "Concept Vision" of both Alternatives B and C. This would include a reduction of the human imprint and the protection of natural resources.

Some Specific comments regarding the alternatives:

Page 1, Alternative B, Paragraph 3: the second sentence, the word "may" should be replaced with "would".

Page 3, "CTA", 6th bullet: regarding control or elimination references "Base control efforts" should be defined.

Page 5, Alternative B, "Fire Management": I especially appreciate that hazard fuel reduction would not occur. I assume that this means fallen or dead trees and natural forest debris would not be removed.

Page 8, Alternative C, "Stock Use": I think the 3rd bullet point under Alternative C should be an important part of Alternative B also.

Page 10, Alternative B, "Waste Management": In the first sentence the word "encouraged" should be replaced with "required".

I commend you and your staff for providing the public with such a detailed review of your work to date on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan. It is my belief that the primary attraction of the ONP is the chance to experience its varied wilderness areas. Thank you for encouraging public participation.

Correspondence ID:	78	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					

Received: Mar,31,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:

I have read about our national park administrators' consideration to further limit citizens' access and use of our Olympic National Park. I hope those making decisions on this issue will vote for Plan A and make no additional changes to our Olympic National Park.

For my husband, children, and now my grandchildren, enjoyment of our national parks has become a family tradition. Before moving to Washington, my husband, children, and I backpacked and hiked many times in Yosemite National Park and also Lassen National Park. We also visited Sequoia, the Grand Canyon, Grand Tetons, and hiked in Yellowstone and Mt. Rainier with our grandchildren. I understand the need for limited use in some areas of some these parks because of the millions of visitors. This limited use is already in effect.

Numerous times, when my husband children and I backpacked in the high country of Yosemite and now when we hike in Olympic National Park, a few miles from the trail head, we can hike for hours without seeing another human. In Yosemite, probably the most visited our national parks, camping in the high country, we could be out for several days without seeing anyone. Consequently, I cannot accept the idea that more restrictions are needed, certainly not a few miles from the trailheads. We are part of nature and many of us feel we must routinely partake of solitude in our natural surroundings.

For individuals and for families outdoor recreation use of our national parks and other parks is about the healthiest and least expensive activity available. Now, snow play in ONP has been drastically restricted and higher entrance fees already diminish taxpayers 'and their families' ability to use what belong to us. Our national parks our part of our national heritage. Please do not take any actions that will further limit our use of our national parks.

Correspondence ID:	79	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	One Square Inch Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	Apr,03,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Sarah Creachbaum,				

One Square Inch of Silence Foundation is a 501-C3, non-profit, dedicated to the preservation of two of Olympic Park's natural resources- -soundscape and quiet.

We have reviewed the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan Preliminary DRAFT Alternative Management Strategies (March 2014) and which to enter these comments into the public record.

We applaud the inclusion of both natural soundscape and natural quiet in all of the alternatives that produce a change from current conditions.

As treated in the draft alternatives, both natural soundscape and natural quiet are listed together, possibly because both resources are often studied by the same office, but it is worthwhile pointing out that these are two separate natural resources as defined by the NPS Management Policy. We therefore suggest that some wording be added to create a wider distinction in the alternatives, possibly as two separate sections. A common assumption is that lowering noise pollution improves both natural soundscape and natural quiet. This is rarely true, since noise impacts on natural soundscape is frequency dependent, whereas noise impacts on natural quiet is detection dependent. Large reductions in traffic noise (both road and air) do increase natural soundscape quality, but may not increase natural quiet. These two natural resources also employ different metrics. We therefore recommend that natural soundscape and natural quiet be treated separately draft alternatives B-D.

there is no mention of underwater environments within the park. Sound travels at 3,000 mph in water, four times as fast as through the atmosphere. Not only can aquatic soundscapes be active and complex but recent research has shown that noise pollution can interfere with the ability of some species to feed and other species to evade predation. We recommend that underwater acoustic environments be specifically mentioned in both natural soundscape and

natural quiet.

Both natural soundscape and natural quiet require a Sound Survey for proper management. Sound Survey software for Olympic Park was delivered to Olympic Park in 1999. A Sound Survey is different than baseline studies; it includes a sound map of the park with daily and seasonal cycles, a sound inventory, and list of significant acoustic features. Significant acoustic features are those sound producing events that are unique to the park (or rarely heard elsewhere) or iconic or of historic, cultural or native value. A Sound Survey produces data that may be useful to characterize acoustic zones and durations of natural quiet.

The preliminary alternatives use 'vegetation' zones instead of acoustic zones, while this is often true; this is misleading and not helpful for management. Vegetation zones are characterized by structure and plants present and not by sounds that come from outside the vegetation zone. Acoustic zones typically follow watershed patterns and other landscape features that form spaces that include all sound events within boundaries.

Natural quiet is used in the draft without qualification. We ask that the word significant be added and further defined to include not just contemporary values but cultural, historic, and native values. Significant noise impact is defined in NPS documents but significant natural quiet is not. By defining significant natural quiet the commonly used metric - - noise-free interval (NFI) - - can be understood and applied by management.

The subject of aircraft overflight should expressly state private and commercial aircraft below and above the 18,000 foot AGL ceiling. The Federal Aviation Administration acknowledges that all current aircraft flying at any altitude produce audible noise at ground level under pristine conditions and so logically, all aircraft need to be considered by the WSP. The National Park Service Tour Management Act of 2000 only applies to commercial air tours operating at or below 5000 AGL. No overflight noise should be specifically under desired conditions.

Finally education is an important and part of successful management and public support. The preliminary draft does address the need to educate noise producers and also should include the need to educate the public. We at One Square Inch of Silence Foundation remain willing to work with the park to provide volunteer services to develop interpretive exhibits, educational brochures, and even lead interpretive walks.

In summary we recommend that the following changes in wording, or the equivalent, be implemented into the preliminary draft.

Alternatives B, C, D

- Partnerships would be formalized to reduce impacts on soundscapes (i.e., to reduce the amount of wilderness overflights by private and commercial aircraft).

- Park management would strive to preserve natural soundscapes to protect biological resources and processes that rely on natural sounds and to provide wilderness visitors the opportunity to experience significant natural quiet. Significant is defined to include cultural, historic and native values.

- Park managers would minimize the administrative use of aircraft and other noise disturbance tools and activities through the minimum requirement analysis process. Low noise-producing tools and aircraft would be utilized where possible. Whenever time is not of the essence, non-motorized methods will be used in wilderness areas.

- Key soundscape sites would be identified by means of a park-wide Sound Survey and monitored throughout the wilderness in each of the primary acoustic zones, and additional sites where noise impacts are of high concern. Significant acoustic features will be identified and protected. Significant acoustic features will be those of high cultural and historic value or or unique to Olympic Park or at least rare outside the park. Noise impact analysis will include methods that predict impacts that occur from noise producing events below natural ambient levels.

- Education programs would be targeted for individuals, groups, and agencies (e.g., military, commercial airlines, and scenic overflight tour operators) in an effort to reduce impacts to the natural soundscape. Educational programs would also be developed for the public to better interpret and appreciate the natural soundscape and natural quiet of Olympic Wilderness.

We wish you well in preparing final Wilderness Stewardship Plan and remain willing to assist in the park in whatever efforts that we may be most useful.

Correspondence ID:	80	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,28,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness. Natural processes rather than human manipulation should prevail in the Olympic Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Strictly protect wilderness values.

Comments: Wilderness is rare and should not be violated.

Correspondence ID: 81 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,28,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Not planning to maintain unneeded structures under the ruse of historic preservation. A commitment to reduce Park Service reliance on motorized and mechanized transport as well as to avoid building new structures for wilderness administration. Most of the alternatives have measures to eliminate overuse.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 82 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: Apr,29,2014 08:16:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is my opinion that the NPS should always offer an alternative that will emphasize Wilderness to remain in an unaltered state. Let the natural processes of nature dictate any changes to the land itself.

The last

thing our wild lands need is heavy-handed human manipulation. Allow

these special places to remain as nature intended: wild and free!

Correspondence ID: 83 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: Apr,29,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

The NPS is not planning to maintain unneeded structures in the name of historic preservation. There is a commitment to reduce Park Service reliance on motorized and mechanized transport as well as to avoid building new structures for wilderness administration. Most of the alternatives have measures to eliminate overuse.

Topic Question 3:
More emphasis on wilderness and less on human manipulation.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 84 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,29,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:
The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:
The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness.

Comments: The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 85 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,03,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: 1. I would like to address soundscape management in particular. I think aside from it, the range of alternatives is sufficient.

2. Blank

3. Regarding soundscape management, I would like to see more specifics, more elaboration on "partnerships would be formalized to reduce impacts on soundscapes (i.e., to reduce overflights...) I would like to know 1) with whom will NPS partner with; 2) will you help to reduce any overflights at any height? I would like to see all overflights shifted from over the park, including the military maneuvers. I think the U.S. Govt should not be exempt.

4. The natural sounds in the park are precious, our refuge from the noisy soundscapes of the cities. Thank you for your efforts!

Correspondence ID: 86 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Olympic Park Associates; North Cascades Conservation Council Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Apr,03,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: 1. Blank

2. Blank

3. Blank

4. Blank

*Address update/add to mailing list only.

Correspondence ID: 87 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,04,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: 1. If you want the voteing public to support the park you need to encourage the public to use it. Publicize the lesser used trails and destinations at backpack stores and magazines. We need more seasonal rangers (they are cheap) and they can "educate" backpackers.

2. 0

3. More access points to lesser known areas.

4. Park "Supers" should unite and complain to congress and newspapers and TV about congress defunding the Park System.

Correspondence ID: 88 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,09,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: 1. Yes

2. Different ways of combining things I value.

3. No

4. In the end, I support whatever actions are best for the marmots. I can adapt. They cannot.

Correspondence ID: 89 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,09,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

More than ever people need to escape the pressures and pace of our technological culture. Spectacular viewpoints, peripheral campgrounds, dioramas and "virtual" experiences are not enough. Those who are able to experience the serenity, solitude, and rhythms of nature will be those who are committed to good stewardship and preservation of Olympic National Park.

Trails and emergency shelters should be maintained. The Park already has enough wilderness area with no trails. Only a very few are privileged to experience them. Don't prohibit access to the rest of the back country.

Fees and regulations should be minimal so that individuals, families and small groups can afford a wilderness experience.

Llama trek services should be continued for people who do not have the physical strength or expertise to backpack on their own.

Let Nature take its own course with regard to the ecosystem and non-native species. Don't spend tax-payer money on such projects as removing the blue weeds along the road to Hurricane Ridge.

Correspondence ID: 90 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: 1. No. All 600 miles of trail needs to be maintained - thus spreading people out. Power saws are needed through out. Helicopters are needed for bridge repair, etc.

2. Educational componet of B, C, & D. I like A because it doesn't say "Keep out - this Park is for plants and animals only"

3. Yes, See #1 [His response to #1 which he's referring to is pasted here: "No. All 600 miles of trail needs to be maintained - thus spreading people out. Power saws are needed through out. Helicopters are needed for bridge repair, etc."]

4. West Side of Staircase should be open to all. Swimming, diving and off trail use must end. the red reef is valuable part of the trail. After 11 years and hundreds of hours of work on zone 4 trails, Alternatives B, C & D make me sad to the point of Civil disobedience.

Correspondence ID:	91	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	Apr,18,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Park Form				
Correspondence:	1. Another alternative would be the status quo.				

2. Blank

3. Do not limit trail access to the park wilderness

4. We need trails open to access the park wilderness. These trails can be maintained by volunteer groups and park employees.

Correspondence ID:	92	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Port of Port Angeles Commission Town or City Government				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	Apr,23,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms. Creachbaum:				

Millions of visitors each year enjoy the Park and in turn support a considerable amount of economic activity within the park gateway community by generating business sales and supporting jobs. The mission of the Port of Port Angeles is to be the primary leader in economic development in Clallam County. Our success at continuing the Port's mission and the wellbeing of the communities we call home is directly related to the thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in revenue Park visitors support each year. The Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) Preliminary Draft Alternatives reduce access, which will result in lower visitor numbers and reduce the economic benefits they generate.

The ranges of the WSP alternatives are not sufficient to meet Wilderness Values, Visitor Opportunities and Socioeconomic Environment Resources detailed 2008 ONP General Management Plan. The wilderness area away from the trail network is pristine such that meeting wilderness values and character within the Park does not need to include reducing the current trail network. Alternative D should be revised to protect natural resources and provide wilderness access in the form of maintaining and improving the current trail and unpaved road systems.

The Port of Port Angeles urges the National Park Service to develop a revised Alternative D that protects natural resources and increases visitor access through a clear and implementable strategy.

Correspondence ID:	93	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Federal Government				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	Apr,23,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	These comments are in response to your March 2014 newsletter and additional information				

provided on-line (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/olymwild>, accessed April 15, 2014). We appreciate the early coordination and opportunity to provide input.

In providing these comments, we recognize the mission of the National Park Service is to preserve multiple values including wildlife for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. As such, wildlife is not the only consideration. In addition, we recognize the constraints of various Federal statutes such as the Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1131-1136) and the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1, 2, 3, and 4). Because of these constraints, the reasonable alternative considered may be limited. On the other hand, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 USC sub section 4321-4375), establishes requirements for considering a full range of reasonable alternatives. Given the early stage of planning under NEPA, the alternatives presented seem to comport with all requirements.

We do note that there is often some difficulty in describing the differences between alternatives when the differences are small. We believe you may face such difficulties as you proceed with planning. In this case, many factors are common to all action alternatives or even all alternatives (including the no-action alternative). Other factors, while different, may be different in subtle ways that could be lost to the average reader. We encourage you to focus on methods and techniques to highlight the meaningful differences to the average reader.

As a general comment, we encourage the continued emphasis on maintaining viable populations of wildlife by maintaining natural and undisturbed habitat and natural ecosystem functions as you develop your preferred alternative.

At this time, we provide five general comments:

1. We encourage you to decrease and minimize the use of motorized equipment (e.g., chainsaws, pumps, and helicopters) in your operations and maintenance. We suggest using the minimum level of motorized equipment needed to accomplish your mission. Such use should be undertaken only after careful analysis and consideration.
2. Fires are a natural ecosystem process important for habitats of many wildlife species. We recommend maintaining a natural fire regime. In some cases (e.g., where past management or fire suppression has resulted in overly dense vegetation or on the margins of facilities and developments), transitioning to such a natural fire regime may require management to prepare for fires. These management actions may include fuels reductions, fire breaks, or other silvicultural practices to accommodate transition to a natural regime that otherwise may have extreme consequences. This preparation may also include prescribed burns or silvicultural preparation for prescribed burns. We encourage use of these tools as necessary to accomplish the goals of a natural fire regime and natural landscapes.
3. Fire suppression and other factors have resulted in loss of prairie habitats over the course of many decades. We encourage the restoration of these important habitats for both their wildlife values and their cultural values. Restoration of prairie habitats may require a combination of silvicultural treatment and prescribed fire. Such restoration is critically important to a number of imperiled species.
4. We believe that manipulative wildlife research, such as capturing and marking wild animals or using radio telemetry, is consistent with the management of these areas provided that there are no permanent facilities or infrastructure established in wilderness as a result. We hope that you would maintain manipulative wildlife research as an option within wilderness areas as you develop the preferred alternative.
5. We assume you will wait until a preferred alternative has been drafted before initiating consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. sub section 1531 et seq.). This will allow us to focus on one alternative and prevent needless consideration of scenarios that may be otherwise dismissed. However, we are available to assist you in the meantime.

In summary, your current reasonable range of alternatives seems sufficient given your statutory constraints. You provide a substantial amount of information that will hopefully become easier to understand as your planning process proceeds. We undoubtedly will have additional questions and/or comments in later phases of your planning. Please keep us informed as you proceed with this planning process.

Correspondence ID: 94 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,24,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

After careful consideration of all the available options I select Alternative B, with some reservation.

While I entirely believe that the remaining 4% of wild lands be left strictly and entirely for the purposes of the flora and fauna, as their last refuge, I also believe that as the caretakers to these lands it should also be our responsibility to restore this area to "as close as possible" to its virgin integrity. So while I wholeheartedly support Alternative B for its majority exclusion of human interference I also feel that some advantages of "removal of non-native species, including fisheries and reintroduction of extirpated species" offered in Alternative C, should also be included in Alternative B. If we do not restore the native species and protect them from further encroachment by both man and non natives then what is the point of setting it aside? I request this change be made to Alternative B.

Another puzzling aspect between the Alternatives B and C is that under B there seems to be a more robust coastal trail system than offered in C. If Alternative B's intent is to have less of an intrusion on the natural setting one would think that it too would have Zones 4-5 offered between the Ozette and Quileute Indian Reservations instead of the current Zone 3s. I request this change be made to Alternative B.

While camping, fishing and tourism are huge components to our state's future, these activities must be directed to the more abundant and easier accessed National Forest lands surrounding this last island of wilderness. The multi purposed utility of our National Forest lands have for too long been dominated for extraction only by a few and with little regard to our ever increasing population and popularity of outdoor activities and vanishing resources. One only needs to take a look at this area from overhead to see the effects of poor planning and supervision.

I wish to thank you for this opportunity to help shape our future Wilderness!

Correspondence ID: 95 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Reading the Peninsula paper 4/24/14 I am very concerned about the proposed changes to our ability to hike and use our wonderful wilderness areas.

I am a 78 year old that loves to hike in the beautiful scenery we have so near to us.

I grew up in Sequim and as kids we back packed in our mountains. My dad fished the streams and rivers.

Lets keep the management similar to what it has been for years.

We don't need those people that may not love to hike dictating to us - and restricting our use of the Olympic National park.

Your helping keep the park for public use will be appreciated.

Correspondence ID: 96 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,25,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: First of all, I want to give you some history. I'm 67 and have been hiking, backpacking, and kayaking the National Parks in this Country for 45 years. And I've been living on the Olympic Peninsula for the past

30 years. During that time, I have been throughout the ONP and the wilderness that adjoin the Park.

I have some comments on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan. First of all, it should be the National Park Stewardship Plan because we're talking about a National Park...not a Wilderness Area. Those are two very different designations.

National Parks are for visitors of all types, ages, and physical abilities. It allows the Taxpayer to visit and enjoy those areas that they support.

Wilderness Areas are more for protection from human activities, where hunting is allowed but very little is done to improve facilities for visitors, other than having trail access.

Restrictions at National Parks should be instituted only in those areas that need to be. There shouldn't be blanket restrictions that cover all areas. Like Bear Cans for instance. I already don't go where bear cans are required because they won't fit in my pack. Even though I've been securing my food safely for years without a bear can.

The National Park should encourage visitors rather than limiting them by instituting increasingly restrictive rules. It seems to me, that ONP has had declining visitors over the past few years.

National Parks are supposed to be accessible, and so roads, bridges, and trails need to be maintained. Access needs to be encouraged. Permits need to be available at the trail head. Park use needs to be "User Friendly", or should I say "Owner Friendly", because citizens pay for the Park.

What you are proposing is more USER RESTRICTIONS and DISCOURAGING USE.

If you keep making the Park unavailable, you will lose support among the citizens. And I mean unavailable by making the restrictions so cumbersome and overbearing that people just "give up and go away". And I often hear from people that that is just what the Park Officials are trying to do . . . KEEP PEOPLE AWAY. Just the opposite of what it is supposed to be doing. The Park is being elitist.

Give us some better alternatives. Ones that say "Visit and Enjoy Olympic National Park, it Belongs to You". If nothing else, keep it the same. From my point of view, things have been going very well. Almost all visitors have a good positive experience. Why put more and more restrictions and limitations on everyone, everywhere? I know that part of your responsibility is protecting the park, but is IS being protected by current regulations.

Please take this into consideration. Believe me, I have been a proponent of ONP (and National Parks everywhere), but these alternatives are way too restrictive and burdensome. I just can't support any of them.

Correspondence ID:	97	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,01,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

The NPS should offer an alternative that emphasizes untrammelled Wilderness. Such an alternative would allow nature to deal with the cards it is dealt, through natural processes rather than human manipulation in the Olympic Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

There are some good elements to the preliminary alternatives. Unlike in the past, the NPS is not planning to maintain unneeded structures under the ruse of historic preservation. In most alternatives, there is a commitment to reduce Park Service reliance on motorized and mechanized transport as well as to avoid building new structures for wilderness administration. Also, most of the alternatives have measures to eliminate overuse.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 98 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Am Against Wilderness Bill Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: Apr,29,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: 1. There should not be any plans to change the National Park, the Wilderness Plan should be forgotten about. We need better trail maintenance and better improvements of the roads and the money that you want to spend to keep people out should be spent to improve camping facilities; like Oregon's campgrounds. So that is my alternative.

2. I'm for plan A keeping it like it is. Then using our taxpayer money to improve the trails and roads not closing and restricting their use.

3. The elements that should be changed are to save the Enchanted Valley Chalet and the petroglyphs out at Cape Alava. The elements of money has not been disclosed, and that should be changed to let people know how much money is involved, with this unpopular plan of closing the Park to people, is supposed to cost!! I would change this Wilderness Bill to forget about it.

4. What do people in Washington D.C. know about ONP? We want the people to have access to it. It is supposed to be for the people to enjoy. We pay for it with our taxes. We want freedom to hike & camp, not all these dumb restrictions & closures.

Correspondence ID: 99 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,30,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I want to support Alternative A, with qualifications, those being that I'd like to see more effort put into maintaining trails and trail bridges to keep open some of the areas that were historically served by good trails. I don't have the figures but I wonder whether the park has as many miles of maintained trails as they did when it first became a park, even without allowing for the years when recreation was encouraged - and that moment in time when a national park is first established normally means something in how a park is managed. And I'm confident that the park has fewer maintained trails than it did when wilderness designation was applied.

I chose to retire here in large part because of the trails in ONP. Now these proposed changes to their management make me wonder how long I can hike here. I'm slowing down with age, I'm carrying more medical paraphernalia, but now the park suggests I should carry a bear can everywhere I backpack and pack out my human waste as well. They threaten to make me get a permit and observe a quota for a simple day hike. Trails which used to have bridges are now impossible to access safely for several summer months due to the need to ford the rivers.

These are barriers to enjoyment of our park

Correspondence ID: 100 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,02,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

I strongly favor alternative b

Topic Question 2:
Their strength and wisdom
I favor alternative b

Topic Question 3:

I'd like to see some aspects of alternative c - specifically restoration , reintroduction, and protection of natural systems , native flora and fauna - added to alternative b

Comments: I'm always pleased to see the WA tradition of "public comments" at work in National Park Service planning

Thanks for doing a comprehensive job of your mission.

Correspondence ID: 101 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,02,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, you have provided a helpful range.

Topic Question 2:

You have focused on different aspects of stewardship.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: I like alternative C, because it places an emphasis on the protection of natural resources. The restoration of healthy ecosystems is so critical to the Olympic National Park, which welcomes so many visitors each year. This alternative also focuses on removal of non-native species, which affect entire fragile ecosystems in the park.

Correspondence ID: 102 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,03,2014 01:03:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

protection of the wilderness and its natural systems

Topic Question 3:

Combining elements from both alternatives B & C.

Comments: Alternative B has a clear guideline for maintaining wild character in these areas. As a further goal, I support the restoration, re-introduction and protection of natural systems, and native flora and fauna - elements from Alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 103 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,03,2014 11:40:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

Protection of the wilderness.

Comments: I prefer Alternative B.

Correspondence ID: 104 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,03,2014 18:24:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, it seems that the 4 choices are adequate for general comments.

Topic Question 2:

In general, I like A, the existing plan the best. The current plan is well tested and provides a good balance between preservation and public access. B goes too far toward restricting access and would discourage young people with less experience and older ones who are past their physical prime from enjoying and learning from the wilderness experience. C is more reasonable and I like the fact that includes a priority for well planned removal of non-native species. D is reasonable in allowing for some improvement when appropriate.

Topic Question 3:

It is a little unclear how the permitting process would work. The ability to get permits in person in Forks and Port Angeles works well. There should be some way for people coming from a distance to make reservations ahead of time but they could still pick them up in person. also, bear cans are important where there is no good way to hang food but bear wires are also effective where provided and should be maintained. Finally, human waste is biodegradable and proper on site disposal in low use areas and the provision of pit toilets in high use areas is adequate. Carrying out of waste by each individual is burdensome and unsanitary.

Comments: Olympic National Park is 95% wilderness and its trail system is the main way visitors can get a true wilderness experience. It has an outstanding trail system, most being historic and dating from the CCC era and before. These trails are part of the cultural heritage and should be maintained and in a few cases improved. An increase in paid and, where feasible, volunteer trail crews to clear seasonal damage should be a high priority. An important goal should be to have a more timely way to restore major slide damage and washed out bridges that can effectively close trails until fixed. In a few cases new bridges might be justified. For example, the Press expedition following the Elwha River and North Fork of the Quinault would be more used if all river crossings had bridges. In summary, the trail system as a whole is a great wilderness cultural and historic resource and the key to experiencing Olympic National Park's wilderness, which is its true essence. It should be given a higher priority in allocation of fiscal resources.

Correspondence ID: 105 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,04,2014 13:09:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes. Sufficient range.

Topic Question 2:

They address human encroachment issues and try to be fair but limit human tendency to run wild in parks with no regard for the damage done.

Comments: I prefer Plan B.

Correspondence ID: 106 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,04,2014 14:58:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

We have the opportunity to provide more specifically the importance of protecting the natural beauty and unaltered vast area for future generations to enjoy. This is not something that should be decided by an individual who is currently in charge of the Wilderness Area, but that person should follow the guidelines that decrease the impact of human contact and preserve this area as much as possible in its natural state.

Comments: This beautiful natural area is so very important to our American heritage. We need to preserve it in its original beauty as much as possible. There are very few places left that have been unaltered, and when they are changed, it is usually to their detriment.

Correspondence ID: 107 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,09,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. We need a well defined trail system option. Trails provide safety for hikers, limit damage to vegetation and encourage the use and support of the area.

Topic Question 2:

Not much. If you do not allow reasonable access to areas why would anyone want to support the park?? People need access to the back country.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. We need a well developed trail system throughout the park.

Comments: We cannot go back to when only the animals and Indians were here. This is the 21st century. The parks belong to the people of the United States to use and enjoy. When you have trails people stay on the trails. When you have designated shelters and camp sites people use them. We need to focus the people's use of the wilderness not keep them out.

Correspondence ID: 108 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,09,2014 19:38:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

choice

Topic Question 3:

no

Comments: Please maintain, as near as you can, the current management system.

Correspondence ID: 109 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Olympic Park Associates Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,10,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

These comments are my personal, not organizational, comments. As an organization, OPA has melded alternatives which might be called another alternative. I support the OPA comments.

Topic Question 2:

I feel the alternatives were well thought out but require the changes as called for in the OPA comments.

Topic Question 3:

I would like to see more about the interrelationship of the wilderness areas of the park with the non-wilderness areas of the park and the rest of the peninsula. How will the non-wilderness areas affect the wilderness areas? How will the wilderness be impacted by Forest Service wilderness and non-wilderness areas - i.e. Dosewallips road? What relationships will there be with Washington State agencies and their adjacent lands - DNR, etc. How can the NPS strengthen ties with the community in ways to support wilderness protection? Can local establishments be used like fireside talks to highlight and teach wilderness values - profiting both the community and ONP wilderness?

Comments: As 95% of Olympic National Park has been designated as wilderness, it is obvious its wilderness plan is central to the character of the park. The question becomes how to protect its wilderness and reap human benefit. Can we use the non-wilderness 5% to provide the looking-glass into the wilderness and as the gathering place to understand wilderness?

Wilderness is not a lockout of humans. Like a place of worship, it needs respect for its values and beauty. It requires deferential use to maintain the ecosystems so important to our own wellbeing. Its beauty draws us in - enchants us, inspires us. Its natural rhythms fascinate us, teach us. To preserve it, we must handle it gently.

We cannot in our love for it trample its value with our feet, pack animal feet, or motorized vehicles. All must enter with respect. In this small part of the world we need to put nature first. We can recreate in wilderness. It can be for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them (wilderness areas) unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness. (Wilderness Act of 1964)

The Olympic wilderness gives back. It takes our dirtied air and cleans it. It removes the carbon dioxide and pollution our way of life puts into the air and water. Doing that, it reduces global warming, ocean acidification, and pollution. It holds and cleans the rain to provide a sustainable source of healthy water. All of this benefits even those who do not step foot into the park. Because of this, future generations will wish there was more.

In the case of Olympic National Park, its presence for the past 75 years has provided the Olympic peninsula with the economic benefits of hundreds of millions of dollars annually from tourist visits. Additional economic benefits come from the clean air and water it provides for the people, salmon, and shellfish resources on the peninsula.

New York City found it could save \$6 to \$8 billion in not constructing new water treatment plants by protecting the upstate watershed that has provided these purification services for free. The wilderness of Olympic National Park, protected as wilderness, provides this watershed protection at no additional cost to all the Peninsula communities.

As a wildlife habitat, it attracts visitors and very economically maintains the wildlife basis for elk, salmon, and a host of other plants, animals, and fish. It is a wildlife habitat more comprehensive than a zoo and provides a better future for the wild species than a zoo or hatchery. All domestic livestock and crops originated from native species. As our world changes, the gene resources in a variety of ecosystems may be needed to provide careful infusion to domestic crops and animals.

Ecosystems provide goods and services that sustain all life on this planet, including human life. If damaged, we cannot fully restore them, no matter how much money we spend. (2010 Center for Health & Global Environment, Harvard Medical School)

The parks reach from ocean to mountaintop provides a wealth of biological variety in genes waiting to be discovered. Discovered for future medicines and agricultural products to be used by us and our grandchildren. Over 50% of our medicines come from nature. We have, yet, to cure cancer, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, Parkinsons, and a multitude of other diseases and conditions. Some of the answers could be in those genes - as the Pacific Yew tree with a cure of some cancers, False Hellebore for hypertension, and the willow tree for aspirin.

hibernating bears lay down new bone, by producing a substance that inhibits cells that break down bone and

promotes those that produce bone and cartilage. Studying hibernating bears in the wild may lead to new ways of preventing the millions of hip fractures that result from osteoporosis - a disease that costs \$18 billion and kills 70,000 people each year in the United States alone. (2010 Center for Health & Global Environment Harvard Medical School).

The loss of biodiversity has already closed promising new avenues of medical research. Australias gastric brooding frog, *Rheobatrachus*, begins life in the females stomach, where it would, in all other vertebrates, be digested by enzymes and acid. This could have led to new insights into preventing and treating peptic ulcers, but studies could not be continued: both species of *Rheobatrachus* are now extinct. (2010 Aaron Bernstein, Project Syndicate, 2010, www.project-syndicate.org)

Wilderness is a true multiple use of our countrys land. So much can happen in one place.

While we can love our human creations in buildings, paintings, and sculpture, we must also save the less than 10% o natures creations still available in this country in chunks large enough to be sustainable and worthwhile. Historic preservation must also include the historic landscape and ecosystems that were here more than fifty, hundreds, or thousands of years ago.

Our ego must respect natures creations. Will this beautiful place be slowly transformed by our use to become like the rest of the 90% o the countrys landscape or can we handle it with care and reap its rewards? Will it become over time undistinguishable from the rest of the world? Can we keep from picking away at its natural fabric with this exception or that exception to it until it is no longer a useful attraction or ecosystem? Can we act as smart as we think we are?

In the Olympic National Parks Preliminary Alternatives for its Wilderness Stewardship Plan, the Park Service has done a good job of defining alternative issues.

I would like to see more about the interrelationship of the wilderness areas of the park with the non-wilderness areas of the park and the rest of the peninsula. How will the non-wilderness areas affect the wilderness areas? How will the wilderness be impacted by Forest Service wilderness and non-wilderness areas - i.e. Dosewallips road? What relationships will there be with Washington State agencies and their adjacent lands - DNR, etc. How can the NPS strengthen ties with the community in ways to support wilderness protection? Can local establishments be used like fireside talks to highlight and teach wilderness values - profiting both the community and ONP wilderness?

I support the Olympic Park Associates comments regarding the Preliminary Alternatives.

Correspondence ID:	110	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,10,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. All alternatives (except no action) result in the loss of hiking trails. There needs to be an "alternative e" similar to the current plan that maintains current trails and structures in inventory.

Topic Question 2:

I do not like the alternatives as none of them are acceptable from the standpoint of recreation.

Topic Question 3:

Trails in zones 4,5, & 6 would still exist and be maintained at minimal levels with the help of volunteer groups.

Comments: We need to not forget why ONP was created:

Olympic National Park founding legislation:

"...preserve for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the people, the finest sample of primeval forests of Sitka spruce,

western hemlock, Douglas fir, and western red cedar in the entire United States: to provide suitable winter range and permanent protection for the herds of native Roosevelt elk and other wildlife indigenous to the area: to conserve and render available to the people, for recreational use, this outstanding mountainous country, containing numerous glaciers and perpetual snow fields, and a portion of the surrounding verdant forest together with a narrow strip along the beautiful Washington coast."

U.S. House of Representatives:
House Report 2247, April 28, 1938

In section 4 Trail Policy of the original document:

"The terrain of the park is such that travel without trails is very difficult, either in the higher elevations above timberline or in the lower areas having dense forest cover. The only exceptions are perhaps within the wider river valleys where grazing or browsing over a period of years has eliminated much undergrowth. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain a large mileage of passable trails if reasonably complete access is to be provided for foot or horse travelers. It is proposed to maintain the park for a principal use as a trail park. Owing to the extremely uneven, broken, precipitous topography, a system of trails becomes necessary, which will probably appear to a casual observer of the park map as almost a gridiron of tortuous trails; yet, in fact, such a trail system will not become in any sense an overdevelopment until years have passed with far more trail construction than is now anticipated."

Since this policy was adopted we have lost over 1\3 (mileage) of our hiking trails. To "preserve for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the people" means to not continue down the same path as the Park has trended over the years. An alternative which promotes access and maintains trails and structures needs to be drafted.

Correspondence ID:	111	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,10,2014 14:37:40				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No. Maintain complete current trail system, replace missing bridges and upgrade maintenance on a few trails.

Topic Question 2:

99.9% o the park's Wilderness is Zone E Primeval in all alternatives. On the other hand, for that reason it is difficult to believe Alt C is actually better for the natural environment than Alt A. They differ greatly in their impact on recreation.

Topic Question 3:

Dozens. Overall, I question the false choice offered between the goals of the action alternatives, which are not exclusive and can all be achieved.

Comments: Abandoned Trails

The National Park Service took over administration of Mount Olympus National Monument in 1933, and Olympic National Park was designated in 1938. NPS intended "to maintain the park for a principal use as a trail park" and embraced an ambitious plan for the construction of many more recreational trails (1938 "Statement of Controlling Development Policies", OLYM-621, page 3).

NPS inherited about 900 miles of US Forest Service trails; some 700 miles of these were all-purpose stock trails. USFS trails then under construction (Bailey Range, Pyrites - Bretherton Pass - Godkin, Rustler, Martin's Park, Mount Hopper-Elk Park) were abandoned. NPS initiated limited trail construction (North Fork Sol Duc, Lake Lillian), but completed only two trails (Long Ridge, O'Neil Pass) before WWII; the remainder were abandoned

before completion.

During WWII and in the postwar years, NPS budgets were very limited. As a new Park, Olympic had few staff with seniority, so suffered disproportionately. Only limited maintenance was performed on a few major trails using Aircraft Warning Service funds. About 250 miles of trails were lost forever.

The Mission 66 program breathed new life into Olympic's trail system. Some 700 miles of surviving trails and many missing bridges were restored, and short new frontcountry nature trails were built. But the trails incomplete were never finished, and the trails lost have never been regained. Additional trails has since been lost: Tshletshy Creek, Muscott Basin, Mount Olson, and many others. There are now about 620 miles of trails within Olympic Wilderness, and the Park has lost half of its "All Purpose" stock trail mileage.

Today, the Park proposes to further downsize and reduce maintenance of its trail system, in Alternative C to roughly half the original USFS trail system it inherited. Alternative D is approximately the trail system that Park has had the budget to maintain in recent years.

The future Park trail system

Although future Federal and NPS budgets are beyond the scope of this plan, and cannot be anticipated, we can anticipate a continuing increase in Park volunteer manpower. One element of Olympic's 2016 NPS Centennial plan is to increase volunteer hours by 10% pr year from 2006 through 2016, for a net doubling of the volunteer effort. Olympic is on track and has achieved this. Trail maintenance volunteer hours have increased even above that goal. Continuing, long-standing programs with SCA and BCHW have been supplemented with WCC and many new WTA work parties on some of the Park's most remote and difficult trails, such as the Bogachiel and Six Ridge. There are many smaller trail volunteer groups and individuals who have adopted the maintenance of frontcountry and "near backcountry" (within day-hike range) Wilderness trails, such as Barnes Creek, Little River, Grand Ridge, North Fork Sol Duc, Four Stream, and many others.

I can only offer a rough estimate that at least 20% o the Park trail system is already maintained by volunteers. (The WSP should provide this information.) This has doubled over the past decade, and there is no reason it may not double again over the next decade, or more within two decades.

Olympic National Forest has a trail network of over 270 miles, on which all routine trail maintenance has been performed by volunteers for the past two decades. The Forest has no trail maintenance staff. Its very limited capital and grant funds go only to the replacement of major trail bridges. In addition to all routine clearing of windfall and brush, volunteers have accomplished dozens of major projects, replacing many trail bridges, footlogs, puncheon, turnpikes, cribs, stone retaining walls and drainage structures.

This Wilderness Stewardship Plan will supercede the 1980 Backcountry Management Plan, and will be the Park's first Wilderness management plan since Olympic Wilderness was designated in 1988. It may well stand for three decades or longer.

Over that time, Park visitation has increased 50%, nd the population from which our trail volunteers are primarily drawn (Olympic and Kitsap peninsulas and south sound) has nearly doubled. This growth is projected to continue.

What constraints will this plan place on a future Superintendent in 2040? Even if future Superintendents have sufficient resources, both staff and volunteer, to maintain the full current trail system, the Park will be hobbled by a plan which has excluded the maintenance of many trails and forbids reopening any abandoned trails. As visitation increases, and is confined to a smaller trail system, impacts may be more difficult to manage, and quotas more widely used. This directly contradicts the purpose for which National Parks were created: for the benefit and enjoyment of current and future generations. The Wilderness Act (section 4) "shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use" to meet this foundational goal. Alternatives B and C violate the intent of both acts.

Plan for the Future

Instead, we should have a Plan which is flexible. Please define a new Alternative E which zones and allows

maintenance of the complete current trail system, defined in the "No Action" Alternative A. It should include the option of restoring to All Purpose status many trails whose maintenance level has dropped to foot travel only. This is essential to maintaining trail bridges and footlogs across many rivers and streams which cannot be forded safely ten months out of the year, and will de facto close many more trails to the majority of visitors.

Separately, the WSP should include a list of trails in priority of their maintenance, and allow this list to evolve over the life of the plan. Please do not misuse plan Alternatives as a means of prioritizing budgets, or limiting the trail system to future anticipated trail maintenance budgets.

Finally, the plan should not forbid reopening abandoned trails to accomodate and disperse growing visitation. This Park has huge areas which shall remain forever trail-less - the Burke Range, the Valhallas, and many more major mountain ridges and river valleys. It does not need to artificially create more.

The explicit trail maps for each alternative would be fine if the WSP were to be revised every decade. In reality, this WSP may have to endure until it is tiered in the next GMP cycle. The explicit trail maps should only be illustrative of the goals of each Alternative, and it should be clearly stated that they are not intended to be permanent constraints over the life of the plan.

If management plans are to be durable over decades, they must be flexible. Plan for failure, and NPS is sure to achieve it. Allow for success, and we at least have a chance of achieving it.

Correspondence ID:	112	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Olympic Forest Coalition Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,10,2014 15:21:52				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Olympic Forest Coalition (OFCO) completely concurs with the recommendations of our colleagues at Olympic Park Associates - supporting an approach that would best protect natural resources and ecological process as displayed in Alternative C with some refinements. Our recommendations incorporate significant elements from Alternative B as well as a few from D.

We also support specific trail zone elements from other alternatives that would increase resource protection yet allow more traditional use on some trails.

From Alternative B, we recommend:

Shi Shi Beach should be zoned 3, secondary, rather than 2, all-purpose. This area has experienced serious overuse. The current access trail descends a steep bluff (similar to overland trails on the south coast, which are zoned 3); the old overgrown military road should not be re-opened for trail access.

The North Fork Sol Duc should be zoned 4 and 5, primitive and way trail; this reflects current use level and difficulty access (river ford).

The South Fork Hoh trail should be zone 4, primitive, to preserve one Westside rain forest valley available for a more intimate trail experience free of stock use and developed sites.

Similarly, the Rugged Ridge trail should be classed as zone 4, primitive, to reflect current use and comply with nearby Hoh-Bogachiel trail zoning.

Aurora Ridge should be zoned 4 and 5 for similar reasons.

From Alternative D, we recommend:

In the following trail zones 2 and 3, we recommend traditional stock use be allowed on the Queets River trail, the Dosewallips/Hayden Pass/Hays River trails, and the Boulder Creek trail (to horse camp/former parking area at Olympic Hot Springs). These would be added to the stock trails already included in Alternative C: the Dosewallips/Anderson Pass/Quinault trails; Duckabush/First Divide/Skokomish trails; Elwha/Low Divide/North

Fork Quinault trail; Long Ridge and (lower) Lillian trails; the Hoh River trail to Elk Lake; and the Bogachiel/Little Divide/Mink Lake trails. All are well constructed and maintained and could be accommodated with minimal impacts to fragile areas.

Topic Question 2:

Carrying capacities and quotas will be set for high-use areas.
No new trails will be constructed.
Visitor use will be managed to reduce impacts on native species.
Exotic plants and animals will be eliminated or controlled.
A restoration plan/EIS for the gray wolf will be developed.
Stock use will be regulated and confined to designated trails.
No new radio or transmission towers will be installed.
Wilderness education will accompany all permits.

Topic Question 3:

We strongly endorse the decision not to consider historic structures to be contributing elements of wilderness character. This clarifies the issue and affirms the clear intent of the Wilderness Act.

Comments: On Park Operations: OFCO favors the moderate directions in Alternative C where park operations would be more reliant on non-mechanized and non-motorized equipment and transport, but with some flexibility in application.

On Fire: Alternative B best recognizes the ecological role of fire in the landscape within the constraints of adjacent lands and public safety. We oppose hazard fuel reduction activities to protect nonessential buildings in wilderness.

On Campsites and commercial services: We agree with the approach in Alternative C that would retain the number of campsites and the amount of commercial services at about the level same as present.

On Wilderness District: To ensure that these and other measures in the plan receive full consideration in the day-to-day management of the park, OFCO requests that the plan recommend a wilderness district be created for the Olympic Wilderness, and a wilderness district ranger appointed to oversee all park operations within wilderness.

We would like to thank the ONP staff for their diligence and thoughtful considerations in the development of this plan. We totally appreciate it!

Correspondence ID:	113	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,10,2014 17:19:51				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
See below					

Topic Question 2:
See below

Topic Question 3:
See below

Comments: - Not in favor of any reduction of bridges including foot bridges
- Not in favor of reduction in trail signage, signage at trailheads, all intersections, area of hazard need to continue
- OK for removal of shelters etc
- Not in favor of 100% reroutable for any areas - needs to be 50%
Campsite reduction only in areas of severe critical resource issues, keep approximately same number

- Not in favor of day use quota numbers, except for numbers above 25
- Against requirement of bear canisters for day use
- Against requirement of human waste bags for day use
- Not in favor of reducing size for interpretive group walks - those are generally in areas near trailheads, already impacted and of short duration
- Against any reduction in trail mileage, need trails of different levels of ability, not in favor of any reduction in trail maintenance
- OK in reducing horse use

Favor current wilderness mgt with minor modifications

Correspondence ID: 114 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,10,2014 20:57:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 I feel the range of alternatives is sufficiently broad.

Topic Question 2:

I like the fact that the alternatives are presented in a way that emphasizes different outcomes of the alternatives, e.g., protection of natural resources vs. human imprint.

Topic Question 3:

On-line as well as in-person permitting should be provided for all the alternatives, given many of the Park's wilderness visitors probably come from out of the area. Having only one or two access points for permitting in a park with such widely separated access points is very inefficient. An educational component about wilderness rules and ethics could be made a necessary component of the permitting process.

Comments: I like the fact that your first statement is that the overall goal of the plan is to restore, protect and enhance the overall wilderness character of the Olympic Wilderness. Stand firm!! As with many past efforts to protect this precious wilderness, I'm sure there will be much local opposition to all of the Alternatives from those who do not understand or value the irreplaceable nature of this protected piece of land.

Existing privies in wilderness areas should be kept and maintained.

Requiring visitors to pack out all human waste would probably be followed by only a few and would be difficult to police in such a large area. The "Cat Hole" method has been in use for many years and should be adequate if combined with an education component in the permitting process.

Bear-resistant food canisters are, at best, an effective but very inefficient device to keep human food away from Park wildlife. Alternative methods, such as food-hanging wires, should be allowed and provided. Those already in place should be maintained.

I like the restrictions in Alternative C that keep livestock out of the sub-alpine and alpine areas. Livestock, including pack goats, are hard on alpine vegetation. Don't you have enough trouble with goats already?

While preserving the "natural" quality of wilderness would preclude building new trails, trails that existed in the Park prior to the time the area was designated as wilderness should be maintained in a manner that ensures a reasonable amount of park visitor access and safety. Prohibiting the use of motorized equipment, specifically chain saws, would for practical purposes make it nearly impossible to keep these trails open, especially in the lowland and montane forest areas of the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 115 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,11,2014 15:57:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No, an "Alt. E" including all current trails (Alt. A) with zoning should be included as an Action alternative.

Comments: The Wilderness Zone maps for each of the alternatives are confusing. The maps are not legible in congested areas (Seven Lakes Basin, Humes Ranch, LaCrosse Basin, Staircase, etc.). Please issue a complete table, listing all the trails and routes depicted on these maps, and their current maintenance level or proposed zone mileage under each alternative.

Referring specifically to ONP_WSP_Wilderness_Zones_Alt_D.jpg map, the following are mysteries to me:

Deer Park - what are the three Zone 5 routes from Deer Park Road in the Round Mountain vicinity near the Park boundary?

Cedar Lake way trail - please confirm that currently allowed stock access is intentionally denied.

LaCrosse Basin area - what is the Zone 5 route from the O'Neil Pass Trail apparently straight down to Enchanted Valley? (Is that what's referred to as the "elk escalator"? Was this the USFS O'Neil Pass Trail route? Was it ever maintained by NPS?)

O'Neil Creek - why is the O'Neil Creek Trail, abandoned for many decades, difficult to even locate, and rarely if ever visited, even depicted as a Zone 5 route, while the adjacent Mount Olson Trail route down the ridge to O'Neil Camp (former shelter site) is not?

Graves Creek to Sundown Lake and Six Ridge Pass - this was traditionally a stock trail; confirm intent is to maintain it for foot travel only.

Finley Peak section, Finley Ridge Trail - abandoned for decades; please specify intent to maintain or abandon.

upper Tshletshy Creek Trail (Paradise Valley) - abandoned for about 20 years.

Kloochman Rock trail - abandoned for decades; difficult to locate, impractical to follow. If it is on the map, why not all of Tshletshy Creek Trail?

Lower Mount Tom Creek trail - abandoned for decades; possible to locate, but if this is useful to depict, then why not also the upper Queets Trail to Hee Hee or Kilkelly Creek?

Blackwood Lake/Pine Mountain ridge route - no established path? The last three miles of the USFS south fork Sol Duc road accessing Pine Mountain were decommissioned several years ago. Is this still a practical route, useful to list on the map?

Aurora Ridge - much of this trail, except the Aurora Peak section, meets stock standards, and the entire trail was built and traditionally used by stock. It is necessary to forbid stock use on the entire trail?

Dodger Point Primitive Trail (5.2 miles) is marked as a stock trail on Alt. D map. Is this a mistake? Upgrading it to stock standards would be a major undertaking.

In general, the Zone 4 and 5 trails and routes are particularly puzzling, as they appear to contain a mix of irregularly maintained, unmaintained and long abandoned trails, routes on which no trail was ever constructed, elk trails, and some off-trail cross-country routes.

Some of the depicted routes (for example, O'Neil Creek Trail, Blackwood Lake-Pine Mountain route, Kloochman Rock Trail) are certainly less used than other more popular routes which are not depicted on the map (for example: abandoned Lake Lillian Trail, the maintained end segment of the Heather Creek Trail, the abandoned Pyrites Creek Trail, Flypaper Pass (route), Gunsight Pass (route), among others). The lack of zoning of the Lake Lillian trail is particularly puzzling, as Lake Lillian has long been an established quota area, and 5 miles of the 7 mile length of the abandoned Lake Lillian Trail survive in good condition and are readily usable (see OMR's book "Olympic Mountains - A Climbing Guide", 2006, pages 343-7).

Similar questions could be asked of dozens of standard climbing routes and cross-country traverses in the Park, many of which are travelled by hundreds of Park visitors each year. Perhaps, for the purposes of this plan, they all might simply be included within Zone 6 "primeval" and not depicted at all? If not, some clear, understandable, purposeful and explicit standard should be defined, determining which are depicted as zone 5, and which are not.

Please realize that each and every trail in this Park has a constituency who really do care deeply about it, who have hiked it, perhaps maintained it, and hope to use it in future. And who hope that future generations may do so, embracing the explicit goal of the NPS Organic Act itself. The WSP needs to clearly and explicitly state what the

effect of each alternative is on each and every trail.

Correspondence ID: 116 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Past ONP Ranger/retired Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,11,2014 20:38:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I will make this simple. I have 2 concerns otherwise the present management plan works fine in my opinion. 1. Retain the Enchanted Valley Chalet even if it must be moved to higher ground or removed from the valley completely and reassembled at the Kestner Homestead or Bunch Field. The chalet is a cultural resource that needs to be preserved even if relocating within Enchanted Valley is not possible. 2. I really object to the old roadway from Graves Creek to Pony Bridge Hill being rehabilitated in the past couple years. That roadway, short though it was, was historically important in this valley. The road was to run across the Olympics and was stopped when the area became a National Park. It was the ONLY trail in this valley where 2 people could walk side by side and talk while hiking. Now it is merely another horse trail where each person has to follow single file behind the other. I think this so called "rehab" of the road into a trail was inappropriate and one more reason many of the people in this valley resent the park though I am not one of them. I can understand the local sentiment. Thank you for letting me comment. RJB

Correspondence ID: 117 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,12,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

The variety of options is a good springboard for discussion, and good look at different ways the park could be managed. I think each alternative is well explained.

Topic Question 3:

No, it seems very thorough.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 118 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,12,2014 10:29:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I think there should be an additional alternative that would increase visitor use of the wilderness and increase trail maintenance.

Topic Question 2:

I think there should have been more thought put into alternatives that increase useage of the backcountry. If the NPS does not increase its user base it risks becoming a low manpower organization like the National Forest and without a constituency in congress.

Comments: In a time when visitor use of the backcountry is decreasing among young people due to computer and television use, I think it is not responsible to even think about further restricting access or reducing access to wilderness areas.

Alternative B recommendation that waste should be packed out the wilderness is idiotic. No one will do it and the Park has no way of enforcing it.

If the Park is going to require Bear canisters in the backcountry they had better invest in some flexible kevlar sacks with a bigger capacity than the current canisters which are too small and bulky for extended wilderness trips.

I prefer Alternative D which encourages continued public access.

Trail maintenance and trail repair need to increase. There needs to be more trail crew effort.

Correspondence ID: 119 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Mr. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,12,2014 11:42:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B "ministers" Wilderness more specifically as Bill Worf intended when he wrote the implementation plan for the Forest Service.

Alternative C administers closer to the Park's mission to preserve and protect.

Comments: Olympic National Park has the opportunity to write its own organic act regarding Wilderness management and define the limits of executive discretionary authority by Park superintendents. This is long overdue.

I admit my despair that Wilderness as defined by the Act of 1964 has become an "unreal" concept to the American public. We have lost our leaders that spoke with passion about the ideals of establishing Wilderness. The Olympic has a tradition of mystery and hard to access hideaways. Just knowing this enables all of us to feel that remoteness still exists, even if most citizens will never get the opportunity in person. Wilderness is a cultural icon that shapes our character and is admired by the least mobile of us.

Despite some public officials request for more user based recreation, this is not an appropriate perspective for a "national" park. I urge you to include:

- - Set carrying capacities and quotas for high use areas.
- - No new trails.
- - Manage visitor use to reduce impacts on native species.
- - Exotic plants and animals should be controlled.
- - Promote the development of a restoration plan/EIS for the Gray Wolf.
- - Regulate stock use, including designating specific trails.
- - No new installation radio or transmission towers.
- - Wilderness education should accompany all permits.

Correspondence ID: 120 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,12,2014 16:46:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Historic Values within Wilderness.

This WSP is tiered to Olympic NP's General Management Plan, adopted in 2008 at the conclusion of a lengthy NEPA process. GMP chapter 4 section "Historical Structures and Cultural Landscapes" on pages 431-432 set clear policy for the preservation of historic structures in its List of Classified Structures in Appendix E within Olympic Wilderness. It reads "Those historical structures and cultural landscapes located in Wilderness would be stabilized

and preserved according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources and wilderness, using management methods that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (1995)... There would be no adverse effect on historic structures and cultural landscapes." The WSP is committed to implementing this GMP policy.

However, the poster "Other Features of Value Quality of Wilderness Character", displayed at WSP public meetings and available on the PEPC web site, states "It has been determined that the only features within Olympic Wilderness that will be addressed within the 'Other Features of Value' quality of wilderness character are Native American resources". Park staff explained verbally that this was on legal advice due to recent lawsuits, and NPS policy would be updated to reflect this change. This overturns the above section of the GMP, specifically as it relates to the List of Classified Structures in GMP Appendix E and potential cultural landscapes in Appendix F, including the USFS Trail System and Enchanted Valley Chalet landscapes eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Historic Structures within Wilderness.

Roughly 3/4 of the historic structures associated with Olympic Wilderness' trail system have been either deliberately removed or have disappeared due to lack of maintenance. The few surviving trail shelters, ranger stations, Humes Ranch, Dodger Point Lookout and Enchanted Valley Chalet are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the park's List of Classified Structures, and their history and condition detailed in the Historic Structures Report. But the WSP scarcely mentions whether or how the Park will maintain each of these significant historic assets under each of the various draft Alternatives.

Several points must be made:

- 1) The decision in *Olympic Park Associates, et al. v. Mainella & Olympic National Park* (2005) did not nullify the National Historic Preservation Act within Wilderness.
- 2) This decision did conclude "The Park Service not need to build replica shelters to be airlifted into locations where the original shelters once stood in order to preserve history." So, don't airlift new replicas into Wilderness. It simply applies a specific, tighter constraint to the Minimum Requirements Analysis.
- 3) This decision did not forbid restoration or reconstruction of historic structures within Wilderness. NPS has concluded (witness Wilder and Bear Camp Shelters) that reconstruction of shelters in place using traditional techniques is consistent with Mainella. These restorations have not been challenged, and deserve praise.
- 4) This decision did not forbid use of helicopters as a minimum tool when necessary for the administration of an area as Wilderness, including historic preservation. Witness helicopter use within Bandelier Wilderness for reconstruction of the failing foundation of a kiva, approved through categorical exclusion without an Environmental Assessment, with broad public praise, and without a single objection.
- 5) The Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Preservation Act became law on April 15, 2014, nullifying one specific court decision which attempted to cite this decision as broader precedent. It reasserts the legislative intent for continued preservation of historic structures, expressed in Senate Committee testimony for both the acts designating Glacier Peak and Olympic Wildernesses.
- 6) Broad claims, such as "Wilderness trumps historic preservation", are not supported by the Mainella decision and have been soundly renounced by Congress in passage of the GMLO HPA.

It is not clear that NPS has authority to unilaterally "set policy" overturning the GMP, let alone nullify NHPA within Wilderness. If it believes it does, it must explicitly state that it is doing so, and cite the origin of this authority.

NPS policy should be consistent over time, and uniform nationally.

The antithesis of consistency and uniformity was exhibited in Park management's recent "decision making process" regarding Enchanted Valley Chalet. Until this WSP process is concluded and a decision memo is issued, the GMP and current Backcountry Management Plan remain in effect. Erratic policy reversals cannot be justified merely by the receipt of a letter containing a veiled and unfounded threat of lawsuit.

Historic Landscapes within Wilderness.

GMP Appendix F lists the USFS Trail System as a potential cultural landscape. This is based on its draft nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, which deserves prominent mention within the WSP and this planning

process.

"Olympic National Park Historic Trails District
Clallam County, WA
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park
Summary

"The Olympic National Park Historic Trails District is eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A in the area of politics/government for its association with federal management between 1898 and 1938. Much of the Olympic Peninsula has remained under federal management since 1898, when President Glover Cleveland first set aside two million acres on the peninsula as a forest reserve. The trail system, which included trail shelters, telephone lines, guard stations, and fire lookouts, was established by the Forest Service between 1905 and 1933, and it formed the backbone of the agency's efforts to pursue its multiple use policies. 962 miles of trail, 109 campgrounds and 90 shelters were built during this time in an effort to shape an inaccessible wilderness into a managed forest."

The nomination continues, outlining the historic and restating the significance of the USFS trail system, the majority of which survives and continues to serve Olympic NP today. However, almost 1/3 of this trail system has been abandoned, and Alternatives B and C propose reduced maintenance level (trail zone) or abandonment (zone 5 or 6) of additional significant parts of this trail system, in Alternative C to half the historic USFS trail system this Park inherited. Little or no regard is given to the historic and recreational significance of each trail.

When a trail is derated from "all purpose" stock trail to foot trail, it is no longer possible to support the maintenance of historic structures or trail structures using pack stock. Construction of a trail bridge or major footlog may easily require a thousand pounds of gear (grip hoists, cables, skylines, chains, shackles, blocks, straps, and tools). Maintenance of an historic structure requires tools, and often requires cedar shakes which are not available on site in every area of the Park (example: Pelton Creek shelter, Fifteenmile Shelter). Reroofing and siding a shelter requires 28 bundles of shakes weighing more than one ton. Loss of stock access will require helicopter delivery of materials by long line. If Park management's interpretation of court decisions is that use of helicopters for historic preservation is not permitted, then loss of stock access to any historic structure will inevitably result in its loss. This must be disclosed and analyzed in this Plan.

When trails are not maintained in Olympic rain forest valleys, they essentially disappear within a decade. No trail once abandoned has been reopened in Olympic Wilderness. So any decision to abandon a trail is an irretrievable loss of an historic and recreational resource, and must be thoroughly disclosed and analyzed in the WSP.

Summary.

The preliminary draft alternatives represent competing philosophies of Wilderness management - "reduce the human imprint" versus recreation and preservation. Natural resources are scarcely impacted by any of the alternatives, as 99.9% remains Zone 6 primeval wilderness under all alternatives, and historic structures occupy less than ten acres or 0.001% of Olympic Wilderness. NPS' responsibility to comply with the policy set in its General Management Plan and with the National Historic Preservation Act have apparently been ignored.

Correspondence ID:	121	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:

Received:	May,12,2014 16:52:04
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

All the alternatives are inferior to Alternative A, which is continuation of current park policy.

Topic Question 2:
Please see below.

Topic Question 3:
Please see below.

Comments: Tourism related to Olympic National Park (ONP) produces \$220 million in economic benefits. Visitor spending supports 2,700 jobs. Any plan that reduces the attractiveness of ONP to visitors could have an adverse impact on the local economy.

The National Park System was created "for the use and enjoyment" of the people. While it is important to maintain wilderness character, it is equally important to maintain access and safety for public enjoyment of the wilderness. Surveys show that 90 percent of visitors want the park to maintain trails and historic structures.

The best plan is Alternative A because it is the only plan that enables maintenance of all existing trails, shelters, bridges and structures. All the other Alternatives are inferior because important ONP resources would be abandoned under the excuse that "wilderness character" would be enhanced.

Of all the Non-A alternatives, Alternative D is most user-friendly because of an emphasis placed on managing visitor use and recreation to provide visitors with greater range of wilderness experiences.

Alternative D has some good features, especially development of appropriate facilities and structures such as designated trails and camping areas, foot logs and small bridges, and signs. Under alternative D, park management would continue to promote sport-fishing consistent with other wilderness values of the high mountain lakes, which is important for attracting tourism and supporting the local economy.

It is important to protect cultural resources, including historic structures and cultural landscapes. This includes buildings (such as the Enchanted Valley Chalet) and trail shelters. Sadly, ONP has been guilty of destroying dozens of trail shelters. The remaining trail shelters should be maintained and preserved for historic and safety reasons. Alternatives B and C are unacceptable because cultural resources will be allowed to deteriorate and "natural processes prevail," a euphemism for eventual loss.

Do not let trails and bridges be abandoned. The best thing about Plan D is that current facilities could be maintained, repaired and even replaced as needed.

Don't stop providing self-registration stations at trail heads. This is a safety issue which has zero cost but has potentially important benefits. Sign-in at the trail head shows that a hiker was definitely there in the event that a hiker does not return when expected.

Online-only registration is unfair to people who do not have the access or ability to use a computer. Yes, there still are some people who do not have online access. The essence of wilderness is that it should be open to all. How ironic it would be if access to wilderness was restricted to the educated elite who are computer-adept!

Alternatives B, C and D mention quotas for day use. Most ONP visitors are day users (who do not remain overnight). It's unclear how ONP would enforce quotas since day users don't require permits and it's impossible to know how long they will stay even if the entry kiosk counts them (an hour? 12 hours?).

Continue to maintain bear wires at designated camp grounds so that hikers will only need to carry bear canisters when leaving food unattended at the backcountry areas that do not have bear wires. Forcing all hikers to carry bear canisters throughout the park is onerous since a simple, inexpensive alternative already exists in many places. It is good that Alternative D does not require human waste bags.

A good feature of Alternative D is the use of pack goats. Because pack goats are more sure-footed than pack mules on steep terrain, more of the trails would be usable by packers using goats (including volunteers maintaining ONP trails). This is the only improvement that Alternative D has over Alternative A, since pack goats are not currently allowed in ONP.

Bottom line: Alternative A is the best because all current trails, shelters and historic structures will be maintained. Alternative D is better than Alternatives B and C (which are unacceptably bad) because more of ONP's resources will be maintained, but it is still inferior to Alternative A because important resources would be abandoned and access to wilderness would be restricted, made more difficult and made less safe.

Correspondence ID: 122 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 04:48:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

all protect what we have left in the Olympics. i like the reduction in vehicle access and the minimal disruption of natural processes.

Topic Question 3:

in plan c i would include seasonally reducing numbers of visitors in areas where high usage is degrading the olympic park nature experience. some accommodation should be made for traveling visitors so they are not excluded from areas they came to see or are redirected to open areas that are comparable. such as sending marymere falls hikers to sol duc falls etc.

Comments: i like all the plans better than doing nothing. i prefer plan C because it does the most to make day hiking a semi wilderness experience. it also does the most to protect what we have left without undue restrictions for those who want to extend their experience over more than one day. as more and more people avail themselves of one of the last places to see real forest and wilderness relatively preserved from human alteration we must restrict human effects on what we are trying to save.

Correspondence ID: 123 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Park user Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No all of these alternatives are limiting and restricting how the people can use the park. If it was me I would restore what the park was meant for it was intended for the people of the United States to use. The park is ment to be accessible for the public. How are elders expose to get through the park if the trails are not maintained.

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives b,c and d are too restrictive

Topic Question 3:

Abandon the wilderness ideas and go back to what the park was meant to be in 1938. A place for ALL the people to enjoy the jet skiers, senior citizens, kids, adults and family, the environmentalists and all political groups also people with disabilities . What really made me look at the parks issues personally was the fact you took away jet skiing at lake crescent. Than when I read the management plan it says it is a place for all people to enjoy not just to make the environmentalists happy.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 124 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: National Parks Conservation Association Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,13,2014 14:40:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes. See comments below.

Topic Question 2:

See comments below.

Topic Question 3:
See comments below.

Comments: May 13, 2014

Sarah Creachbaum, Superintendent
ATTN: WSP Preliminary Draft Alternatives
Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

On behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) and our more than 750,000 members and supporters, I respectfully submit the following comments on the Olympic Wilderness Stewardship Plan Preliminary Draft Alternatives.

NPCA appreciates the wide range of alternatives presented in the preliminary draft. By combining the best strategies from the range of alternatives, a reasonable plan can be created that will allow the park to preserve the wilderness character while allowing appropriate access. NPCA looks forward to reviewing the final alternatives that will provide more detailed descriptions of the policies to be employed under each alternative.

In general, NPCA supports Alternative C, which aims to meet the purposes of the Wilderness Act with an emphasis placed on the protection of natural resources. This alternative represents the best protection of the natural resources of the park, which must be preserved for present and future generations to enjoy the park experience. In an age of limited resources for the park, alternative C looks to the future of this park by focusing on regaining ecosystem balance through a focus on removal of non-native species, reintroduction of extirpated species, restoration of natural fire regimes, and allowing natural channel migration of the park's waterways. The reasonable limits placed on visitor use are employed only to protect resources that could be lost or irreparably damaged otherwise. Allowing these resources to be lost is against the purpose and mission of the park. NPCA also supports the wilderness zone approach in alternative C. We believe the trail classifications are correct in this alternative.

However, there are sections in which other alternatives provide a more successful approach:

Overarching Concept

NPCA supports alternative C, but also supports alternative D's statement regarding facilities. Current facilities should be replaced if necessary. Providing designated campsites, bridges, trails and privies will provide for the protection of natural resources by constraining the impacts to a single area instead of encouraging dispersed camping and other activities. By including this provision from alternative D, the park can meet the goal of protecting natural resources while also allowing visitors a wide range of wilderness experiences.

Fire Management

NPCA supports the approach of alternative C, except when it comes to hazard fuel reduction. NPCA is concerned about historic structures burning down in the wilderness, but at the same time hazard fuel reduction in the wilderness to protect historic properties does not seem consistent with the Wilderness Act. Allowing this activity may result in aggressive removal of trees and other fuels which may disrupt other attempts by the park service to restore the natural fire cycle. Primarily, further clarification and definition in this alternative is necessary. The prescription of "reductions . . . at a minimal level necessary" in alternative C is unclear and needs further explanation.

Permits

NPCA supports the education of wilderness visitors through the in person permit process, as provided for in alternatives B and C. However, NPCA also supports the use of an online permitting system even though it may not be as effective as in person education about wilderness values. NPCA is concerned about finding ways to encourage use of the park by youth and potential future park supporters. In addition to the in person process of obtaining a permit, the online system may appeal to younger park visitors who rely on the internet on a daily basis. Allowing access to permits online may attract younger visitors who might not otherwise visit the park or the park's wilderness. Therefore, NPCA supports the employment of alternatives C and D in this instance.

Signs and Other Route Markings

NPCA understands the park's desire to reduce the wide variety of different types and designs of signs, however we support alternative A, the No-Action Alternative, for dealing with signs and other route markings. The number of signs are very helpful to the wilderness visitor in telling them how far they have gone, how much further they have to go, when they have crossed into areas of high elevation where campfires are prohibited, where backcountry campsites and privies are located, and when they have left or entered the boundary of the park, among others. Many signs in the park also help visitors comply with regulations with which they may be unfamiliar. We support maintaining current signage and think reducing signs is the wrong direction.

Ranger-led hikes/programs

NPCA supports alternative D's direction to increase ranger-led interpretive hikes. Visitors unaccustomed to the wilderness and young visitors in particular can benefit from participating in ranger led hikes. Visitor who may not feel comfortable striking out on an unfamiliar trail may take part in a ranger led hike. Those familiar with a trail may also join a ranger led hike to learn new things about a favorite trail. Ranger interaction is an important part of a visit to Olympic National Park and these opportunities should be increased.

Marine Debris

NPCA support the decision in alternative B to remove small pieces of marine debris without the use of helicopters or other motorized equipment. Large pieces should be removed by the minimum tool necessary. The park should also continue to support and engage volunteers during the annual coastal cleanup.

Aircraft Use

NPCA supports aircraft use as envisioned in alternative B. Aircraft use should be limited as much as possible and scheduled during times of lower visitor use when feasible.

While in general NPCA supports alternative C, there are several actions within C that NPCA vigorously supports:

- Cultural resources, including historic structures, would remain largely undisturbed and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes would prevail.

- o This is critical to maintaining an intact wilderness. Except for human safety or preventing ecological damage, natural processes in the wilderness should not be manipulated or compromised.

- Park management would seek to remove non-native fish species in rivers and lakes within the wilderness area.

- o Non-native fish can impact native amphibians and occasionally downstream native species, reducing wild stocks and wild stock resilience.

- Visitor use management strategies would be implemented for the protection and preservation of natural resources, which could reduce or redistribute visitor use, or implement area closures for restoration.

- o Maintaining appropriate access is essential to preserving the park and its resources. While visitors must be allowed to enjoy and experience all the park has to offer, in some instances certain resources must receive extra protection to preserve them for future visitors to enjoy.

- The number of trail miles open to stock use and designated stock camps would be reduced to levels the park is

able to maintain to trail standards as established in this wilderness stewardship plan.

o With a limited park budget and competing priorities, the park must be allowed to commit resources to the benefit of the greatest number of visitors. Trails used by stock require more resources to maintain than hiker only trails. In some cases this may mean reducing a few miles of trails open to stock use due to lack of funds to hire a trail crew able to maintain it to stock standards. It is questionable if volunteer crews alone can complete this type of maintenance, which includes wider trails, higher clearance on the trails, stronger and more substantial bridges, etc. However, alternative C maintains many of the popular stock trails including Enchanted Valley and the Hoh River Trail.

There are also several actions common to B, C, and D that NPCA strongly supports. These include:

• Park staff would strive to manage species across boundaries on a landscape scale as a response to effects of climate change.

• Park staff would inventory for the presence of non-native wildlife species such as, but not limited to, mountain goats and high mountain fish. Strategies for mitigation and removal of non-native species would be developed, implemented, and monitored for effectiveness.

• Fisher reintroduction is complete and would continue to undergo monitoring.

• A restoration plan/EIS for the gray wolf would be developed.

• Park staff would work closely with adjacent land managers to achieve consistency in cross-boundary issues (such as threatened and endangered species protection, climate change, etc.).

The final two issues NPCA would like to address concern waste management and the proposal to require bear canisters parkwide:

• NPCA supports the park's decision to encourage human waste bags, but not require them below 3500 feet. We support the direction of alternative C which would require human waste bags in subalpine areas and above (3500 feet and above from alternative B) when no other facilities are available. We support maintaining existing back country toilets. We agree with the goal of reducing helicopter flights to remove human waste and therefore support efforts to replace unsustainable toilets with more efficient toilets (for example composting and solar powered toilets).

• Many wilderness users find bear canisters uncomfortable and difficult to carry. They are bulky, hard and heavy compared to traditional food bags. There is also some difficulty transporting bear canisters in kayaks. NPCA recommends the park service analyze and consider the installation of food lockers, or "bear boxes," in wilderness camping areas as an alternative to requiring the use of bear canisters. However, NPCA supports the current proposal to require bear canisters parkwide for several reasons:

- 1) Requiring the use of bear canisters parkwide creates a uniform standard that is easy to follow.
- 2) By removing bear wires, potential damage to trees will be reduced.
- 3) With a reduced number of rangers due to budget cuts, the ability to maintain bear wires is extremely difficult. If a bear wire falls and is not fixed, wilderness visitors may come prepared only to hang their food. Without an available bear wire it is difficult to hang food which would lead to many people not hanging their food at all. This would increase the danger and possibility of human/wildlife interactions.
- 4) Bear canisters not only protect food from bears, but raccoons, mice and other animals that are often more troublesome than bears.

In conclusion, NPCA appreciates the forward looking nature of these preliminary draft alternatives. By combining some aspects of all the alternatives, as described above, the park can develop a plan that balances the need to preserve and protect the wilderness values of the park while maintaining appropriate visitor access. We thank you for allowing this opportunity to be involved in the process and look forward to reviewing the final alternatives.

Sincerely,

David G. Graves

Northwest Program Manager
Northwest Regional Office

National Parks Conservation Association
1200 5th Ave, Suite 1925
Seattle, WA 98109
PH: (206) 903-1645
Cell: (206) 463-0821
FX: (206) 903-1448
dgraves@npca.org

Correspondence ID:	125	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes.					

Topic Question 2:

I mostly support Alternative C. It protects natural resources and processes. I want to best protection of the wilderness with the least motorized impact by humans.

Topic Question 3:

I don't think historic structures within the Wilderness should be protected. Some were built before the Wilderness designation should be allowed to die a natural death.

Comments: I support the recommendations of the Olympic Park Associates. Their members love the park and have studies the Alternatives carefully. I hope that you will make the changes they recommend.

Correspondence ID:	126	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes.					

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

Per Wilderness Watch, I favor the following modifications to alternative B:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 127 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B with modifications.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 128 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of

Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 129 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 130 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
see below

Topic Question 2:
see below

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	131	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	132	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you for accepting these comments.

Correspondence ID: 133 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Mr. Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 134 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a concerned US citizen, I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 135 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 Please preserve the Olymoic Wilderness.

Comments: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

PROTECT THE OLYMPIC WILDERNESS! THANK YOU.

Correspondence ID: 136 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 See Comments...

Topic Question 2:
 See Comments...

Topic Question 3:
See Comments...

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	137	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes, with minor alterations.				

Topic Question 2:

Alternative "B" seems to be the only truly appropriate choice. Prohibiting motorized vehicles of any kind, at all times, is in keeping with the wilderness designation; exceptions to be made for life-saving emergencies. Allow nature to take it's course except in certain exceptional situations (such as trail damage, for instance). limit nature trails and/or interpretive trails to the edges of the wilderness

Comments: Wilderness should be wilderness. The definition is clear. I am especially upset when I see the Park Service making exceptions to any kind of motorized vehicle of any kind. it's an affront to the mission of the Park Service and to those of us who were promised "wilderness". Keep it wild - - God knows there is little enough left!

Correspondence ID:	138	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: yes				

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be

conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	139	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Please select Alternative B				

Topic Question 2:

It protects the park, which is the whole idea of a National Park - it's for the people not profits for the few

Topic Question 3:

Do more to protect the Park

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	140	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules. b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains. c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail. d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures. e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.				

Correspondence ID:	141	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
See comments

Topic Question 2:
See comments

Topic Question 3:
See comments

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

â€¢ prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

â€¢ prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

â€¢ leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

â€¢ allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

â€¢ confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 142 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 143 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 144 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Urban Wildlife Research Project Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
They cover so much territory, they hit right into the heart of the critical issues.

Topic Question 3:
I'm not yet familiar enough to answer that question.

Comments: Those who live in the urban environment are stuck for they know not what they do. The city hires a tree trimming firm. They go in and trim, trim based on what they know and most of that is antiquated. In the process they wipe out a significant corridor.

This is but one example. We need to form educational teams who show the tree trimmers, the developers, anyone who is changing the landscape in any way to have we need to find ourselves in close relationships with the wild. We need to connect with companies, with institutions, with governmental agencies, companies, corporations, etc. and train them so that they may see, modify there way, and unite to preserve the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 145 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The alternatives should include an option that maximizes the Wilderness character of the Olympics.

Topic Question 2:
Option B does more than the other options to give priority to maintaining Wilderness characteristics.

Topic Question 3:

Exclude motorized vehicles and power equipment completely, except for emergencies. Remove existing structures that degrade the Wilderness experience. Let Nature run its course.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 146 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: At large Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,13,2014 21:49:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Not bad for the Park Service

Topic Question 2:

The options for NPS to really implement wilderness resource management by choosing Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

Honor the Wilderness Act of 1964....NPS, at times, suggests that management is above and beyond the scope of the Wilderness Act of 1964

Comments: Your implementation of Alternative B should retain elements of surprise and Discovery for the visitor, not a Disney Land Experience....Managers must not use economy, comfort and convenience as management touchstones....You are the example not the exception....The public will notice your typical and routine self-serving management privileges....Search and rescue are the exceptions...There is a huge Challenge before the NPS to implement the Wilderness Act of 1964 as it is written....True, there may be enabling legislation that created the Park with specifics in mind...professionally you must not allow them to be an excuse to not implement the Wilderness Act of 1964...This is the 50th Anniversary of Wilderness, let's celebrate that by recognizing wilderness as a resource, not a recreational activity

Correspondence ID: 147 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
It is sufficient because Alternative B with modifications will work. If Alternative B with modifications isn't adopted, the range is not sufficient.

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications listed below:

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 148 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 149 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

I like the emphasis on conservation and wilderness character, mainly in alternatives B and C.

Topic Question 3:

I don't like the proposals for overnight permits. I appreciate the need for an educational component, but for people who go on numerous wilderness trips every year it seems unnecessary. I think there should be an annual wilderness permit, and you would go through the educational process once a year.

I also do not understand why fax would be preferred over email as a way of obtaining call-in permits. Do people really still use fax machines?

Generally, I think some flexibility needs to be available with permitting. Changes in weather can and should alter plans in the wilderness, and it is dangerous for people to feel bound to an itinerary that may become unsafe when the streams rise.

Comments: Generally speaking, I support alternative B. In our over-developed world, the wilderness is a sacred and extraordinary place. We still have much to learn from the experience of unconstrained natural forces. Too many people take our wilderness areas for granted, perhaps because they're spoiled by the efforts of conservationists of previous generations. But we cannot take these places for granted- -- the park's greatest asset is its wildness, and this

should be rigorously protected.

I believe there is a need for better communication about wilderness issues, and the underlying reasons for this process and for the alternatives presented. My impression is that many hikers feel resentful about the de-emphasis on recreation of the proposed alternatives. I don't share their resentment, but I think the park needs to make more of an effort to communicate the ideals, concerns, and reasoning that form the basis of this process. In other words, you're on the right side, but you need to win the hearts and minds.

Correspondence ID: 150 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 22:00:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Comments: We are in favor of Alternative D. As long-time National Park patrons, we have visited many of the national parks, monuments, etc. We have spent the most time in Rocky Mountain National Park.

When we moved here and were able to spend more time in Olympic National Park, we came to realize that it's not nearly as visitor friendly as most other national parks we've visited. Trail head markings, directions and signage seem very limited.

We are completely against Alternatives B and C. What is the point in "reducing the human imprint" when so much of the Olympic National Park is already quite inaccessible?

Correspondence ID: 151 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
I like alternative B, reducing the physical human imprint on the environment as much as possible.

Comments: I love visiting this area and want to see it preserved.

Correspondence ID: 152 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
They provide a range of options.

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 153 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, there is a sufficient range of alternatives, however, my preferred needs to be expanded on.

Topic Question 2:

The alternatives seem to cover the legal definition of the NEPA requirements for an EIA, with Alternative B being the only one in tune with the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness my preferred Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience). However important clarifications and modifications should be made to the preferred Alternative B:

1. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
2. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
3. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
4. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. confine human-nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 154 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
See Comments below

Topic Question 3:
See Comments below

Comments: I agree with the following approach for our Wilderness areas

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	155	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I feel that Alternative B is the only alternative that respects the purpose of designating an area as Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

What I like about Alternative B is that it addresses the key components of wilderness - - specifically: a) to keep cultural resources intact; b) to prevent the incursion of both motorized vehicles (except for emergency rescue) and buildings or other structures; c) to let nature take its course without introducing man-made change or man-made prevention of change.

Topic Question 3:

Any alternative seriously considered should keep to the rules of wilderness, as stated in the answer to Question 2.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	156	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Comments: I only approve of the alternative where:

1. Human imprints are reduced in the wilderness including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 157 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 158 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 159 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As I understand them, the alternatives are: A) no action; B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation opportunities.

If my understanding is correct, there are too many options.

Topic Question 2:
Very, very little.

Topic Question 3:
See Comments, below.

Comments: We hold our public lands in trust for future generations of Americans; they are not ours to diminish or destroy. As such, I support the management approach described in Alternative B, with the following modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 160 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Mr. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 161 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I have never visited Olympic Park, all I have to say is that the human species is destroying our precious planet, and that the human species had better wake and understand that we must save all that is natural, our wildlife our parks, our trees, our forests our rivers, all of our water ways and oceans, stop all of the destruction and killing of our wildlife. We need more of what nature offers us not less, trees absorb green house gasses, this is a crisis today, climate change.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 162 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Too many - only Alternative B with the provision in full, that the park remains 100% wld...

Topic Question 2:

The park for its being should be 100% wld with out change

Topic Question 3:

100% wld wit human interruption is necessary for the protection and preservation of all national parks

Comments: A. No motorized equipment or transport shall be allowed ever

- research/administrative functions required to adhere to rules

B. prohibit new structures, installations and developments UNLESS
essential for protection of wilds

C. leave cultural resources undisturbed

D. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded
-limit all human activities

E. confine natural trails to the front country
- NO trails shall ever be attempted or repaired in the WILDERNESS

Correspondence ID: 163 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 164 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Option B is by far the best option. I would like there to have been an even more "protectful" option.

Topic Question 2:

The more preservation and protection for this amazingly beautiful and diverse region, the better! It really is a special place and needs humans to preserve, rather than exploit it.

Topic Question 3:

More protection, not less.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 165 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives A and D have nothing to like about them; C is minimal improvement over the current policies.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	166	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I believe this is a sufficient range of alternatives for discussion, but the only alternative for the preservation of this wilderness area is B. I've included some additions to B as well below.

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	167	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B

Topic Question 2:
Nothing

Topic Question 3:
I would suggest the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 168 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 22:42:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
broad range

Topic Question 3:
no

Comments: Please select option B as it maintains minimum human impact.

Correspondence ID: 169 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
Alternate B best protect the Park. I have visited there and worked in a number of other National Parks. It should remain wild and free from overdevelopment. It is most valuable in its pristine state.

Topic Question 3:
I think that mechanized access should be limited and trails should be simple.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 170 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: retired Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
I only like alternative B.

Topic Question 3:
No.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 171 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, it seems Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for a wilderness experience. However, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibiting the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensuring that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibiting new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leaving cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allowing natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confining nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 172 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 173 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: . Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 174 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you!

Comments: Let's keep the Olympics wild!

Correspondence ID:	175	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	person Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:
I like Alternative B

Topic Question 3:
The more the whole area can be left as wild as possible, the better.

Comments: Please Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 176 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the front country and do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 177 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I really prefer only one alternative, B, because it is the only option that would fulfil the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B if it includes the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you for your consideration.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 178 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: see above

Correspondence ID: 179 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 23:08:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

Options - things to ponder and think about.

Topic Question 3:

I think that keeping it as natural as possible is the best solution. We - people - seem to trash everything we get our hands on. And with climate change - we need to protect our nature more so than ever!

I say B is the best option - keep us out so we don't screw it up!!!

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 180 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting the wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the listed provisions and modifications, this is truly the only alternative that will allow wilderness to remain, instead of becoming a cultivated park.

Correspondence ID:	181	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support alternative B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness

Topic Question 2:

The least human impact on the wilderness as possible

Topic Question 3:

I would also like to add the following recommendations:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	182	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
See below

Topic Question 2:
See below

Topic Question 3:
See below

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 183 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.
Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

L

leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Topic Question 2:
That several are being considered in open forums such as this. Hopefully public input will be seriously considered.

Topic Question 3:
Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	184	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Phoenix Trading Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Investigate photographic safaris walk to attract tourism and raise get funding for Environmental causes				

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	185	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	West Valley Neighborhoods Coalition Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes, particularly Alternative B.				

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

- Topic Question 3:
- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: As above.

Correspondence ID: 186 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Creativity

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 187 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
There is an adequate number of them, and one that I can support.

Topic Question 3:
No. See below.

Comments: Please be advised that I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 188 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
I would like to see this Wilderness protected more than it is now.

Topic Question 3:

See comments below. thank you.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	189	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience)

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

I am a frequent visitor to the area, since my mother and sister live nearby in Yelm, WA

Correspondence ID:	190	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support and hope you will support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	191	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:	
---------------------	--

Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:
------------------------	-------------------

Yes, I support the management approach described in Alternative B, but the following provisions and modifications.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

Yes, I propose the following modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Comments: Alternative B with the modifications above emphasizes that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID:	192	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:	
---------------------	--

Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:
------------------------	-------------------

Yes, with some modifications as specified below

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the most favorable to maintaining the integrity of the park.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	193	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:	
---------------------	--

Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:
------------------------	-------------------

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of

Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Helps maintain the best & highest stste of wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

No, I believe that Alternative B addresses all important issues.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 194 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 23:45:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative B.

Correspondence ID: 195 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 196 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Stewardship Plan Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,13,2014 23:51:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
There is sufficient range of alternatives, yes.

Topic Question 2:

I believe, as a loyal American citizen, that we must maintain our natural resources for all future generations to appreciate and be overwhelmed by. Thus, Alternative B is the best and only one that we should be focusing on.

Topic Question 3:

We must, absolutely must prevent further erosion and expansion of developed campsites and "developed" areas. This is a WILDERNESS and needs to remain as such.

Comments: Powell would be aching with pain to know that we are even considering development and destruction of the magnificent wilderness that America once had. We must, absolutely must, seek Alternative B and save the vastness and magnificent Olympic Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 197 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes; in fact, there is one too many, the "no action" alternative.

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B, C, and perhaps even D would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

I suggest that the management approach described in Alternative B include the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 198 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This is more than sufficient, since some of them are not consistent with wilderness protection.

Topic Question 2:

I like alternative B, which protects the wilderness from further human-induced degradation. Special care needs to be taken to prohibit man-made structures within the wilderness and motorized vehicles. Nature trails need to be situated near the campgrounds, not in the wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

If you follow Alternative B, nothing needs to be changed.

Comments: This is the most beautiful place I have seen in my life and I have traveled and backpacked a bit. To think that any man made structures, improvements or conveniences would be considered makes me afraid for it. Please do all you can to maintain this forest's unique wild nature and limit man's impact. This means no cattle grazing, no logging, no motorized vehicles, no structures, no concessions, no human "management" that so often means selling the wilderness to the highest bidder or killing indigenous species. Keep it as it is.

Correspondence ID: 199 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 200 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: . prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 201 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
I like plan B.

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 202 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, in my opinion the range of alternatives is sufficiently broad.

Topic Question 2:
They are common sense and doable.

Topic Question 3:
I do not feel that any changes are necessary except for the resulting requirements as a result of climate change. One thing that may be considered is a firefighting system/plan as drought becomes more of a problem.

Comments: The plan can be accomplished if approved now. Waiting or postponing setting goals will only make them more difficult as time moves forward.

Correspondence ID:	203	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the provisions and modifications which prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, except in emergencies. and which ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules; prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness; leave cultural resources undisturbed, and allow natural processes to prevail; allow natural processes to operate unimpeded and limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures;confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	204	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 3:
We support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 205 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
See comments.

Topic Question 2:
See Comments.

Topic Question 3:
See Comments.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 206 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
It is adequate.

Topic Question 2:
Please see my comment below.

Topic Question 3:
Please see my comment below.

Comments: I am a visitor to this beautiful area.

I have watched wild places around me become "civilized" or "urbanized parks". It changes forever what can be seen and done, who lives there and who disappears, i.e. birds, mammals, reptiles.

Therefore, please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 207 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Only alternative is to protect the land.

Topic Question 2:
Only alternative is to protect the land.

Topic Question 3:
Extend the frontier.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 208 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 209 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 210 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:54:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support Alternative B.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 211 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 212 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
NA

Topic Question 2:
NA

Topic Question 3:
NA

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 213 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
My suggestions are listed below.

Topic Question 2:
I prefer those that ensure the sanctity of the wilderness in the face of development.

Topic Question 3:
My suggestions are listed below.

Comments: I write to express my support for the management approach described in Alternative B, which would hopefully include the following provisions and modifications:

The prohibition of motorized equipment and motorized transport, for example helicopters, except in valid emergencies. Assurance that research activities and other administrative functions will adhere to these rules.

The prohibition of new structures, installations and developments unless necessary for protecting the undisturbed wilderness. This category would include buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins that distract from the character of the wilderness, and are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management of the Olympic Mountains.

Leaving cultural resources undisturbed, and yet allowing that whenever they may be threatened by natural processes, natural processes shall prevail.

Allowing natural processes to proceed unimpeded. Limiting human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific work like repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confining nature trails to the frontcountry, while avoiding including highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness Areas.

Thank you for your time and consideration, now do what you need to do to protect the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	214	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the management approach described in Alternative B and allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.				

Correspondence ID:	215	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B. Alternative B alone meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (a real wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should include the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 216 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Myself Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Topic Question 2:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 217 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 Yes

Topic Question 2:

The most important alternative is to keep the wilderness quality as intact as possible. The others may not do that.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 218 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

I believe that the range of alternatives A;C;D cover only insufficient parts of all important concerns in that matter and therefor I favour clearly Plan B, which is a wholesome, ideal approach.

Comments: I fully support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 219 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I don't see any alternatives

Topic Question 3:

N/A

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 220 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 221 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
Option B supports objectives of reducing human impacts on 'wilderness' areas.

Topic Question 3:
Yes. I support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except in a case of an emergency. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments, unless shown to be essential to protecting a wilderness area. Buildings, such as trail-shelters and cabins, undermine a wilderness character. These are mainly items of Forest Service and Park Service management on The Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed. If they are threatened by natural processes, then natural processes should be left to continue.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restorations, such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the 'front-country'. Do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in The Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	222	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	No.				

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	223	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	Yes.				

Topic Question 2:

I very much support Plan/Alternative B. It provides for protection of wildlife and wilderness as the directive should. This is not a theme park and so use of motorized vehicles should be limited to the entrance way/parking. There should not be low flying planes or choppers stressing out the wildlife which is a vital part of this ecosystem. There

should be trails only in the very limited front part of the park and no interpretive group trails. I see this as a rare and beautiful chance to protect and preserve a piece of our country. Overdevelopment would not meet that goal.

Topic Question 3:

I think most of the elements are contained in Alternative B but possibly a few new elements are mentioned above in answer to question #2.

Comments: I congratulate you for planning something so vitally important in such an intelligent and caring way.

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to express my views on this Olympia Park Plan. I may be old but I do care about the future and it gives my life meaning.

I hope your lives will be given meaning through this process as well, now in the decades to come.

Correspondence ID:	224	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				
	a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.				
	b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.				
	c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.				
	d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.				
	e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.				

Correspondence ID:	225	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Mr. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				
	a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.				
	b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.				
	c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.				
	d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.				
	e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.				

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 226 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Certainly. But, my preference is that human impacts be reduced in the Olympic Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

All four options give greater or lesser nods to the fact that this is a wilderness area and that motorized boats, trail bikes, ATV's and guns will not be a part of the "recreational value." The area will be protected and appreciated as "wild" rather than as "used or visited."

Topic Question 3:

If option D is chosen allowing greater backpacking and infrastructure for the that to occur, I would like to see it made very clear at each and every trailhead and through other means, perhaps at outfitters and the like, what hikers can do to reduce their footprint such as carry out their trash, not make fires, or fires of certain sizes, etc.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 227 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

We must preserve the wilderness areas for our wild animals.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 228 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 229 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:**

May,14,2014 03:36:43

Correspondence Type:

Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

There is no alternative that prioritizes the wilderness experience of the visitor, that finds ways to allow dispersed, undirected activity, with no reservations, no designated sites, no toilets; freedom to discover and respond to the wilderness, unconstrained by anything but a requirement to practice minimum impact behavior at all times.

Topic Question 2:

It appeared most of the regulation was along trails, otherwise I didn't like any of them very much.

Topic Question 3:

1. Prioritize combating the most serious threats: Goats and noxious weeds, before heavy visitor regulation.
2. Recognize that one of the most important wilderness values is freedom from schedules, and so reservations should be eliminated except maybe a very few places.
3. No bagging poop.

For details about these ideas, read my comments below.

Comments: Tom Shindler

3492 Little River Rd

Port Angeles, WA 98363

Response to the Draft Wilderness Stewardship Plan:

I love the Olympic wilderness, spend as much time as I can in it, and have been an advocate for its preservation AND enjoyment since I first arrived here over 40 years ago. I worked for 9 summers as a season Park Ranger, 8 of them in the Backcountry. I have walked every trail, and much of the land between trails. I was eagerly one of the first to walk on the new lands being exposed by the Elwha River Restoration Project.

In the course of training, first as a volunteer, and then as a backcountry ranger, I learned minimum impact concepts and techniques from Bruce Moorhead, Bob Kaune, and Paul Crawford. At the same time, from Jack Hughes I learned respect for the visitors right to direct his or her own experience. I have had opportunities to try concepts, and experiment with techniques, both personally, and as the field manager of the popular high-country destinations of Grand Valley and Royal Basin (and everything between). I got to see what caused impact, and what didn't. I learned how to leverage my effort to minimize impact, restore damage, and maximize visitor enjoyment and experience of the wilderness.

Please don't take my criticisms personally. But please take them seriously. My observations, criticisms and suggestions come from a shared value, and from experience in the trenches, as well as treasured experience of the wild Olympics.

Wilderness management is not an obvious, generic thing. There are many competing priorities and trade offs. It requires creativity, and must be particular to the place. It requires commitment to the absolute minimum regulatory intrusion on both the wilderness, and the visitors wilderness experience. Currently, Olympic relies too heavily on intrusive measures, and all of the alternatives in this plan would only increase this intrusion. At the same time, it appears to me that the most critical threats are ignored.

I would like you to seriously consider adopting the following policies in any management planning you undertake:

Quotas, Reservations, and Designated Campsites (paradoxically) degrade the wilderness experience, and should only be used when they are the minimum tool, and absolutely necessary (less than currently).

Of the current impacts to wilderness EXPERIENCE, the single greatest detractor is the necessity of following a regulatory schedule and itinerary. To have every camp mandated in advance, to be at a given time and place, forces

the visitor to keep these elements of civilization foremost in their awareness. The visitor must forsake discovery and spontaneity in order to comply with the law. This over-arching requirement prevents or inhibits some of the most valuable wilderness opportunities. Were these requirements in force at the time, many of my most memorable and important wilderness experiences would not have happened.

With a legally fixed itinerary there is no opportunity to follow the mood, weather, and discovery of the wilderness. If you walk through a place that captivates you in a way you never expected, and want to stay and explore or enjoy it, you cant. Its a forced march to your reserved campsite. If the berries are ripe, or the sunset beautiful, or the wildlife observable, or the river peaceful, or the lake warm enough to swim in, or youre just too tired to climb that hill& whatever the unexpected occurrence, the reserved campsite takes precedence over experiencing the wilderness. Its like putting billboards along the trails.

I consider this a very serious tradeoff. It is a cost that must be justified by any benefit of quotas, reservations, and designated campsites. John Muir, the patron saint of wilderness, would have been in violation of the Parks regulations constantly, because his trips were guided not by an itinerary, but by discovery, by listening to the wilderness itself, and following where it led him.

Solitude is easy to find in the Olympics, and should not be used to justify regulations that degrade the visitor experience.

There are many ways, and many places to find solitude in the Olympic Wilderness. Most trails are not heavily used, and if solitude is the objective, visitors can choose those places. Even along heavily used routes, one need only travel mile through the forest away from the trail, and most likely will see no one until returning to the trail. Even camping with solitude has been possible near heavily used areas (unless/until prohibited). Except in exceptional terrain, there are always natural campsites, that can be used with no trace, not far from the areas where people seem to congregate, where one can be unaware of others.

While it is true that there are places that can get very crowded at times, the lack of solitude in those places, at those times is not a problem that the Park Service should consider serious enough to regulate for that reason. One should not expect solitude (in good summer weather) at Olympus Guard Station, Lunch Lake, or Moose Lake. However, I have seen crowds in all of these places, but was always able to walk less than hour to a place of solitude.

Crowds can have physical and biological impacts on the wilderness, and these impacts must be mitigated, but the solitude itself is usually a human choice. How many visitors would willingly accept a 75% chance that they would be turned away from their choice of destinations in order to be guaranteed relative solitude if they were lucky enough to get to go there?

My observation is that overnight use has declined since my ranger days in the late 1970s and early 1980s, so overcrowding is not a growing problem that needs to be nipped in the bud. Rather, the Park Service should seriously consider the political effects of a decreasing user base. It is those of us that have had our lives transformed by wilderness that will be its defenders, and there are fewer of those people coming up. So, until the out-of-the-way trails begin to be overrun, or there is a clamor among hikers to have their choices rationed, solitude should be considered a naturally occurring element of the Olympic Wilderness, that needs no regulation to facilitate.

The greatest threats to the natural wilderness environment are exotic goats and weeds, dwarfing any impact visitors may have.

When I was a ranger, it was a part of my job to observe goats, as well as people. What I saw was that, wherever there were goats, even intermittently, human impact was multiplied 4-10 times. A party could camp in an appropriate spot, and leave no trace of their presence, until the goats came in, found the campsite, trampled, and excavated for urine and other salt until the site was severely impacted. This paradoxically made it more likely that the site would be used, and impacted more by humans, which would then attract more goat visits. This cycle is quite destructive, and does not occur significantly with native animals.

There is a similar cycle that builds trails where native animals and visitors have never made them. Goats are attracted to human destinations, and their travel to them will create trails where none existed before. People will then

see and follow these trails when exploring (otherwise) wild places. The human use of these goat trails will then attract more goat travel (in search of salt), and more impact (digging for it), which makes the route even more obvious for people, and so forth. Many animals make trails that people then follow, and following these game trails is a wonderful experience of the wilderness, but there is no feedback loop with naturally occurring animals, so there is no additional impact.

It appears that the goats population that is rebuilding after their near-elimination in the 1980s are more aggressive than the average for the population previously. (perhaps because the more aggressive ones were harder to catch&) This has caused the goats to become a greater safety and survival threat to human enjoyment of the wilderness (and maybe other animals too&). Allowing non-native animals to scare and kill wilderness visitors violates all the wilderness values there are.

The most cost-effective way to promote the long-term health of the Olympic Wilderness would be to devote nearly ALL available resources (including political, and interagency) to eliminating the goat population. At this time, there is no more useful, efficient or effective wilderness protection effort than to eliminate the exotic mountain goat population. As long as there is even one breeding pair of exotic mountain goats left in the Olympic Wilderness, all other efforts toward on behalf of the wilderness are relatively wasteful, and will not return as much long term wilderness value as goat elimination.

I know that extraordinary provisions, even legislation, may be necessary to eliminate them from the adjacent National Forest wildernesses, but they are the greatest threat to both wildernesses, and the Park needs to take on the politics and prevail. This issue needs courageous leadership from the top.

Also serious, and virtually ignored, is the spread of Herb Robert (*Geranium Roberti*, aka Stinky Bob) into the wilderness forests. It risks a greater long-term natural destruction than the current scale of visitor activities could ever have. Look at the Ennis Creek valley between Peninsula College and Hwy 101, and you will see the fate of many square miles of the Elwha and other valleys. All native ground-cover is eliminated by this one species. It doesn't need disturbed area to spread, and so will eventually colonize large swaths of wilderness forest if left unchecked. It doesn't seem to be attractive grazing for animals, so its spread will negatively impact herbivores in the Park, and with them the whole ecosystem.

Im not aware of the threat to other valleys, but I know the Elwha is at great risk. Already there are significant pockets of Herb Robert in the Humes Ranch/Krause Bottom area. There is nothing to stop these from spreading to the entire valley over time, if they are not eliminated soon. In cooperation with the DNR, I am fighting the Herb Robert population at the Little River Trailhead, and know how much effort it requires. It has colonized the first mile, and it takes 30- 50 hours of labor each year just to prevent further spread. It would take more to actually win the battle.

Herb Robert is also aggressively colonizing the former Elwha lake beds in a way that will provide a huge, permanent refugium from which to spread up-valley and up-slope into the wilderness. Nothing short of an industrial scale battle will prevent that. The good news is that being non-wilderness, and virtually unvegetated currently, delicate work is not necessary. Restoration project funding should be able to make it happen. Personally, I would recommend aerial hydro-seeding with a native seed mix, over the entire area, just to get something growing there first, then following with hand pulling and spraying the noxious weeds that still take hold. Backcountry style restoration work is too tiny to be effective against the noxious weed invasion that is taking place there. Preventing the eventual spread of Herb Robert will require hundreds of hours of labor each year, but without it, the Elwha Valley, and ultimately possibly all the valleys will fall to this menace.

Again, any effort the Park puts into mitigating visitor impact to the wilderness would be better spent eliminating this biological impact, which will grow geometrically to dwarf the human impact.

Much of the impact blamed on CURRENT overuse of subalpine areas is actually the residual impact from the old days when campfires were common.

Most popular high country destinations show bare spots, a proliferation of social trails, and other evidence of overuse and human impact. My professional observation, while a ranger, was that most of this was not caused by

ongoing use, but is a long-term result of past use of campfires. The search for firewood was a major cause of camp area trail proliferation. The seemingly permanent bare spots have been sterilized by years of fires. All the available fuel for a wide radius has been gathered to burn, and slow-growing trees have not replenished it.

The prohibition of high country campfires has probably done more than any other single effort to reverse the impact of wilderness visitors. Let it keep working. Backcountry staff should have a high priority for full obliteration and restoration of any high-country campfire site or scar. Its time consuming to do a full job that leaves the site unrecognizable as a campfire site, but this activity goes farther toward minimizing human impact than any other visitor impact management.

No bagging poop!

Except for the single existing human fecal waste bag requirements on the high-use glacial corridor on Mount Olympus, this is not a productive solution anywhere else in the park. Environmentally acceptable cat-holes are possible within an easy walk of almost anywhere that is not rock and ice. Ever since Bruce Moorhead explained the dynamics to me, I have observed and used this method, and it is always possible. Asking visitors to bag their poop is inviting a public health impact that will make Giardiasis look tame. It also environmentally irresponsible, because it prevents proper composting of the poop wherever it finally ends up.

It is an education issue. We were pretty successful in Grand Valley (well above the 3500 foot threshold suggested in the plan) in the early 1980s. We removed all privys, and in their places installed little signs explaining how to correctly perform the cat-hole method. Even with over 70 campers in the valley on a Saturday night, there was little to clean up afterwards, it took one ranger, one shovel, and less than 1 hour worth of cleanup stops while patrolling the valley to deal with it. On average, thats less labor/visitor than managing a toilet, and less visitor impact than bagging. Done correctly, human waste is no more out-of-place in the wilderness than that of other animals. Pooping on the ground is indeed the most natural thing, anything less diminishes the wilderness experience.

Another point: Toilet paper, when included in the same hole with poop, will decompose in days. There is no need to require any different treatment of the toilet paper. In particular, dont ask people to burn it. Use a stick to push it into the poop in the cat hole, and its nothing more than a little extra fiber in the poop.

No day hiking limits (unless impact increases dramatically from the present).

Limiting how many, or who can pass through an area is far too restrictive for far too little gain. Day hiking is inherently so much lower impact that such limitations would rarely make sense anywhere in the Olympics. Education would go much farther than limits. If the limits are for solitude, rather than impact, see above.

Continue to allow hikers to depart from a remote trailhead without going out of their way to a staffed ranger facility.

In particular, no one should have to travel to a staffed ranger station to get a permit to day hike from another trailhead. The dispersed nature of the trailheads in ONP is such that this is an unreasonable burden for any gain it might have. It especially impacts people who walk, bicycle or hitchhike to the trailhead, or who arrive at non-working hours. The park service should promote transportation efficiency, and requiring someone to drive and extra 10-50 miles out of their way is environmentally irresponsible.

Any zone that includes quotas, and/or designated campsites should extend no farther than mile either side of the trail corridor (with some exceptions for very open terrain).

However trails turn out to be zoned, establish that, (with appropriate exceptions), any areas greater than to 1/2 mile from the trail system are zoned for dispersed, non-directed use: no site reservations, no constructed or designated campsites, etc. A cross-country permit could be issued for such use, whose recipients would be expected to have exceptional minimum impact behavior.

Ideas:

Provide wilderness training and certification to allow more flexible limits for certified users.

While the limitations I have criticized above may be necessary for some inexperienced or untrained backcountry travelers, those with minimum impact skills and values may actually reduce their impact by NOT following that pattern. A program of education, with a test, could provide visitors an opportunity to earn a certification that would qualify them for a more flexible set of regulations.

To be certified, some of the requirements would be to:

- " understand how to find and use appropriate cat-hole soil,
- " know which vegetation communities are fragile, and which are resilient,
- " understand human - wildlife dynamics,
- " have skills and equipment to minimize both normal impact, and prevent emergencies, and
- " understand what it means to leave no trace, etc.

Those with such certification should be allowed to use dispersed, undesignated sites to camp, and in doing so would have even less impact than those with reservations for a designated site.

This concept is too big to detail in this response. I have lots of ideas about how to actually do it (which I would be glad to share). There are also examples of training and certification programs working in other situations just as challenging. The exercise of this flexibility could not only increase the number of people able to experience the wilderness without imposed schedules, but decrease the total visitor impact.

A quick example: When I was first introduced to minimum impact dynamics in the 1970s, I thought about how to camp with minimal impact, and decided that a hammock could be a good way. Since then, I have used a hammock for nearly all my solo trips. Besides being lightweight and comfortable, it provides the ability to camp nearly anywhere there are trees, and to use sites that are never used by anyone else, and will never show that use. Even my summer as the Bailey Ranger, nearly all my nights away from base camp were with the hammock. The dispersed use it allows decreases impact more than any designated site ever could. Im sure there are other non-standard systems that enable dispersed minimum impact.

Allow stock only where the trail can be maintained to be hardened to their impact. (meaning that stock use will not degrade the trail for foot travel.)

It takes far more effort to build and maintain trails that can withstand stock, than it does to build and maintain trails for foot use. The Park should establish which trails pack stock are necessary for administration and facility maintenance, and other trails should not be open to stock unless they can be maintained to that level of resistance to impact. Backcountry Horsemen, or other volunteers should be given the opportunity to expand the extent of stock-capable trails by fully hardening trails to a stock standard

All the alternatives show Little River Trail as a stock trail. I dont think that makes sense.

Please excuse the length of this response. It would be longer if I had more time.

Thank you for considering my views, and good luck finding creative solutions.

Tom Shindler
tom@shindler.us

Correspondence ID:	230	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and

modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	231	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the best - see comments below.

Topic Question 3:

See comments below.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 232 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
Detailed.

Topic Question 3:
See below for details, please.

Comments: I like "B" with these provisions, thanks!

- a. no use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. no new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 233 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	234	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: see below				

Topic Question 2:
see below

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	235	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	236	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I fully support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness. "Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains."

Quoted from the Wilderness Watch, Guardian email

Correspondence ID: 237 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 04:31:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep the Olympic Wilderness Wild meaning I favor Plan B.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 238 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B which includes the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:
No.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 239 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B is the only one which meets the purpose of The Wilderness Act

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B should be modified to minimize human interaction and emphasize natural processes to make restorations.

Comments: Wilderness should not have highly developed, interpretive trails. Allow natural processes to prevail in wilderness areas.

Correspondence ID: 240 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
n/a

Topic Question 2:
n/a

Topic Question 3:
n/a

Comments: National Park Service

<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=58015>

Re: Protect the Olympic Wilderness/Preliminary Draft Alternatives - ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan

The National Park Service is drafting a management plan for the 876,400-acre Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park (95% of the park is designated Wilderness).

The planning process is at the critical stage where the agency determines the various alternatives that will appear in the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). If the alternatives don't adequately address or include the key issues facing the Wilderness, then neither will the final plan.

Olympic WildernessThe Park Service has identified four alternatives: A) no action; B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation opportunities.

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

I write to express my support for the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you for the opportunity to bring these remarks to your attention.

Yours sincerely,
Robert E. Rutkowski

cc: House Minority Leadership

2527 Faxon Court
Topeka, Kansas 66605-2086
P/F: 1 785 379-9671
E-mail: r_e_rutkowski@att.net

Correspondence ID:	241	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Kevin Spath Counseling Service Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I and my family and all future generations support the management approach described in Alternative B. In the Spirit and intent of the Wilderness Act, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

We need to keep some parts of our Earth free from human disruption. I'd prefer we take that extra care with parts here in the USA.

Comments: We are Stewards of this planet. Lets together take a stand against rampant consumerism and greed.
Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 242 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes sufficient but I prefer alternative B which should be re-worked somewhat.

Topic Question 2:
I don't like A, C, D

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B is my preference with the following changes...

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies
make sure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness
buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains
leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded
limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Comments: For some strange reason humans have come to believe that we should "manage" nature and forests and that we can do this better than natural processes. I think we have been proven wrong over and over again. Our wildness areas do need need loud and destructive human activities to be enjoyable, forests d not need tr EVER be logged.

Correspondence ID: 243 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes!

Topic Question 2:
The management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.
Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 244 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B best represents the intent of wilderness designation, and should be adopted.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments: I support alternative B

Correspondence ID: 245 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support alternative B. There is insufficient wilderness in the lower 48 states and that which we have should be maintained as it is.

Topic Question 2:

Basic definition of wilderness is included.

Topic Question 3:

I do not like ORV traffic in wilderness areas. There should be no motorized traffic allowed anywhere. Trail usage should be very limited.

Comments: I support the Wilderness Society's position on this plan.

Correspondence ID: 246 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

Regarding the management plan for the 876,400-acre Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park, I am in complete agreement with Wilderness Watch's support for the approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.

Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Sincerely,
Deb Friedman

Correspondence ID: 247 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

i support fully the comments of wilderness watch and believe wilderness is the way to go. we need to keep out the building, the oil rigs, the logging, the burns. we need to leave our forests alone. we need to keep out the rodeo and glyphosate too. the attacks on our forests by govt agencies are as bad as the attacks on the people of american by our govt. its unceasing attacks and mauling. we are all suffering. wilderness is what is needed.

Topic Question 2:

i do not like alternatives picked by corrupt govt agencies.they are all corrupt. they are taken over by profiteers who look to use them up for profits for themselves. we need protection - true and totalprotection from govt which is mercenary as can be.

Topic Question 3:

i want wilderness protection. full wilderness protection.

Comments: i do not think our govt agencies are good planners or good stewads. it hink they are lousy stewards and deserve an f minus for the harm they do to forests. leave the forests alone. leave the land alone from constant mauling.

Correspondence ID: 248 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: private citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Let the Wilderness manage itself with minimal human imprint and intervention.

Correspondence ID: 249 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B includes the following provisions and modifications which I like:

1. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

2. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

3. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

4. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

5. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Please approve Alternate B.

Correspondence ID: 250 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 04:59:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

Not much. Only one really addresses the environment.

Topic Question 3:

Take out all that imply a certain level of greed and outside interference.

Comments: Develop an alternative that reduces the human imprint on the Wilderness (see #2 above) including prohibiting motorized equipment, helicopters, etc., new building, no disturbance of cultural resources, allow natural processes to happen, limiting nature trails.

Correspondence ID: 251 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Ms. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act. It minimizes human impacts.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 252 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect this precious wilderness

Correspondence ID: 253 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
See below

Topic Question 2:
See below

Topic Question 3:
See below

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 254 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 05:15:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
It is sufficient.

Topic Question 2:

The fact that they are alternatives and thus give various choices.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: I favor Alternative B.

Correspondence ID:	255	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.				

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	256	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:

I generally support the management approach described in Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

The following provisions and modifications should be made however:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Thank you for asking!

Correspondence ID: 257 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 258 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 259 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Citizen of New York Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want the following in the Stewardship Plan:

- 1) Prohibit new structures, installations, and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains; and,
- 2) leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail; and,

3) allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Correspondence ID: 260 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 261 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
I like option B the best

Topic Question 3:
strict following of the policies with adequate enforcement

Comments: we need to keep the Olympics wild with limited human impact

Correspondence ID: 262 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Being that my husband grew up in Seattle I have visited the area numerous times. The Olympic region is terrible with the massive deforestation to the point where it is so upsetting I can not visit there. The region should be declared a National Park. So no, I don't like the options. Of the alternatives, B is the only one that comes closest.

Topic Question 3:
While I choose Alternative B because it minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to

operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	263	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

The national parks should be protected from outside development - therefore I support Alternative B - with amendments as per Wilderness Watch's suggestions.
please keep the national parks wild - the way they were intended by Theodore Roosevelt!thank you.....

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	264	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	self Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes.

Topic Question 2:

B and C would be an improvement over the current policy but Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 265 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I like Alternative B. Notes below.

Topic Question 2:
No motorized equipment except for rescue equipment used in emergencies.
No new structures!

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 266 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 05:29:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE OPT FOR PLAN B

Correspondence ID: 267 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: none. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 05:30:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the only option that stays within the Provisions of the Wilderness Act.

Comments: Please support Alternative B
Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and transport, this to include helicopters except in the case of emergencies.

Correspondence ID: 268 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should include the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 269 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, I feel that the alternatives presented cover the expected approaches. I favor Alternative B but would have liked to see that, in cases where lands have had minimal disturbance, modifications accommodating natural management processes can and will be accommodated.

Topic Question 2:

They accommodate different approaches to the management of Federally held land.

Topic Question 3:

No, not at this time, especially since I have a preference that you have covered - Alternative B.

Comments: As a forestry professional and an avid outdoors person, I have had the pleasure of experiencing many Federal and State public holdings - Parks, Monuments, Forests and Wilderness. Given my personal work with trees and my interest in forested lands, I have spent a great deal of time studying varied management approaches for each of the above referenced categories.

Given the pressures of human development and the incursions we have made into available open green space, I believe it is vitally important that we deviate from our normal management strategies when it comes to lands that are wild - "wilderness."

The associations that exist between the flora and fauna that populate are in a delicate balance and the collective ability to manage that balance as it evolves is quite clear. It is therefore inherent on us as wanna-be managers to step aside and allow natural processes to proceed without any intervention.

I also believe that, given all the existing recreation opportunities in our Parks and Forests, human presence should be at its most minimal in these remaining wild places. I would hope that Alternative B would be the alternative of

preference, with modifications for Wilderness that is still undisturbed and should remain as such.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment during this important planning period.

Correspondence ID: 270 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 271 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes; but it is imperative that we continue to stress wilderness and keep the impact of humans to a minimum.

Topic Question 2:

Emphasis on wilderness

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 272 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The Park Service has identified four alternatives: A) no action; B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation

opportunities.

Topic Question 2:

An alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation opportunities.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, you must minimize human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

We must learn to be CARETAKERS of our world and STOP the poisoning and destruction of our resources - STOP the destruction of our air, water, earth and most of all, killing our wildlife due to man's indifference and GREED.

Correspondence ID:	273	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

Several types of "Alternative Management" are listed.

Topic Question 3:

I CAN ONLY SUPPORT THE MANAGEMENT APPROACH DESCRIBED IN A L T E R N A T I V E B WITH THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS AND MODIFICATIONS:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: AT THE RISK OF BEING REPETITIVE, Alternative B IS THE ONLY SATISFACTORY CHOICE AND SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING SPECIFIC PROVISIONS AND MODIFICATIONS:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 274 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 B&C are good starting points; B is preferable.

Topic Question 2:
 Meet the purpose of the Wilderness Act

Topic Question 3:
 I support the management approach described in Alternative B with the provisions and modifications listed in the comments section.

- Comments: 1. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
3. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
4. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry; do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 275 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

None of the alternative except for B meet the intent of the Wilderness Act. This is wilderness, I urge you to keep it as a wilderness which means minimizing human impacts, campsites, trails, etc. All of these are disruptive to animals. Animals have a right to exist!

Topic Question 2:

The Park Service does not have a good record in protecting wilderness. Human impact MUST be kept to a minimum. No off road vehicles, human incroachment, preservice sokitude and protect primitive and unconfirmed recreation. Alternative C and D should not even be on the list for Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Remove alternative D. Again this is wilderness and to open wilness up to a "variety of backcountgry recreation opportunities" does no meet the intent of the Wilderness Act. Alternative B is the only alternative that meets this intent.

Comments: Alternative B should be amended to emphasize:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammee wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 276 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

These are the basics that need to be evaluated

Topic Question 2:

There are a few that will encompass

Topic Question 3:

I believe the less we disrupt & damage the area, the better

Comments: B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness;

I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of

human control.

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Let's keep the Olympics wild!

Correspondence ID:	277	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

The Park Service has identified four alternatives: A) no action; B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation opportunities.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	278	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Miss Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 279 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

Nothing much other than Plan B which reduces human impact.

Topic Question 3:

See my comment below.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 280 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Good range of alternatives

Topic Question 2:
Wide spectrum, from no action to protection, to recreation

Topic Question 3:
NPS should comply with Wilderness Act, not try to find a way to get around it or reinterpret it.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 281 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 282 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: sierra club Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B is the correct choice.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the best choice from an environmental viewpoint.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 283 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support Alternative B

Topic Question 2:
Respect for nature and conservation

Topic Question 3:
See my 5 points in Comments. They must be observed.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 284 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
WE believe in Alternative B is the solidly best option!

WE support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains. Please keep them out of this area.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

We must allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Topic Question 2:

We feel the alternativeB will maintain the vast wildness of this Olympic Wilderness as it should be. A totally natural vista for us and future generations to admire and respect. More and more wilderness areas are being decimated. Once they are compromised there is no returning to their magnificent natural state! They need as much human protection as we can offer. We are the Steward of this earth, and should maintain as much "wilderness" as we still are fortunate to have right here in America!

Topic Question 3:

We believe you should confine nature trails to the front country.

Definitely do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: The Olympic Wilderness is truly a marvel, a treasure belonging to America and its people. There are many species of flora and fauna found only in this area. We should do all possible to protect it in its natural state, without encroachment of human "footprints" (roads, buildings etc). There are so few places like this, where nature can reign and we must protect them forever! Thank you for considering these comments.

Correspondence ID:	285	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Environmental Studies Department Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	286	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: see #3				

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	287	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	288	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: yes				

Topic Question 2:

I only like alternative B

Topic Question 3:

the strongest protections of the wilderness need to be upheld. please do not allow personal or corporate interests to interfere with what's best for the purity of the land for all life and generations to come.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	289	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	290	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2: B				

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 291 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes. too many if you ask me.

Topic Question 2:
All but the one of more human interaction.

Topic Question 3:
Eliminate plan D

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 292 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 293 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes... Backcountry in the Olympics should not be any further developed

Topic Question 2:
The strength of Alternative B as least impact...

Topic Question 3:
I have been in the Olympics several times and the allure is the wilderness... Unless you have a world class resort or some cheesy park lodge you are not going to draw more people. Additionally that kind of draw will only compromise the integrity of the wilderness... Something the NPS should begin addressing - protection and preservation, not generating more human activities in the last "protected" places!

Comments: I support a management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 294 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	295	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes.					

Topic Question 2:

I like that there is an alternative that I feel is acceptable to my passion for environmental stewardship. I strongly support the management approach described in Alternative B including the provisions and modifications as detailed below in my answer to question 3.

Topic Question 3:

Change Alternative B as follows:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	296	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Ms. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Comments: We need to keep our Wilderness areas Wild, and not an open season for motorized vehicles and development.

Correspondence ID:	297	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Alternative B meets the objectives of the Wilderness Act and should be selected.				

I hiked across the Olympic Peninsula in 1966. I hope future hikers will have the ame wonderful experience I had.

Correspondence ID:	298	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: see comments				

Topic Question 2:
see comments

Topic Question 3:
see comments

Comments:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID:	299	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	The Go-Back Club Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Keep the Wilderness wilderness forever and for all the life therein.

Correspondence ID: 300 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Not quite. See comments below.

Topic Question 2:
That there are several with some but not enough protection.

Topic Question 3:
Yes. See comments below.

Comments: 1. SI support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 301 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternatives B and C are an improvement over the current policy.

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support Alternative B with the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	302	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: i support alt b				

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	303	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	The Country Gardener Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, I believe so.

Topic Question 2:

I especially like Alternative 'B', which essentially leaves the wilderness undisturbed. I prefer to see human access limited to the perimeter, to places like Hurricane Ridge, for example, and to trails which don't penetrate into more remote wild areas.

Topic Question 3:

I feel satisfied with Alternative 'B' and don't see a need to make changes.

Comments: The Olympic National Park should be allowed to continue as predominantly wilderness. Let's save some small portions of our beautiful and once wild country to be protected from rampant exploration and development by industry and tourism.

There are vastly fewer places for wildlife to roam/fly undisturbed than there were when I first began hiking and backpacking in National Parks in the early 60's - more than 50 years ago.

The trend the past several decades has been to open up more wild areas with road-building and oil & gas exploration, a trend I'd like to see reversed.

So you have an opportunity to protect this particular portion of the country's remaining wilderness from further human encroachment - for wildlife, for peace and quiet, and for future generations. Please respect our heritage. Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	304	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: D is unacceptable.				

Topic Question 2:
Not much.

Topic Question 3:
Omit D.

Comments: In the future, we made need some resources of the area - - tampering with Mother Nature always leads to the need for more tampering, as we see the outcomes of our original tweaking.

Correspondence ID:	305	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:

Option B will reduce the physical human imprint in the Wilderness, meeting the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.

Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 306 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The alternatives are OK with some amendments to my preference. Please see my comments below.

Topic Question 3:

The wilderness should continue to be just that WILDERNESS. To experience the wilderness is to experience a "wild" natural area with natural sounds and areas undisturbed. We keep developing our wilderness areas until they are no longer "wilderness".....and that creates problems for wildlife who require a natural undisturbed area in which to live and for the humans who want to experience a true natural wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 307 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Leave the area as it is. Only permit motorized vehicles or transport in an emergency.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 308 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, however B is the only acceptable alternative.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 309 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
I like alternative B

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 310 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support Plan B, which provides for as little human interference in this wilderness area as possible.

Topic Question 2:
Plan B leaves the wilderness mostly untouched, as it should be.

Topic Question 3:
I would accept Plan B as it is. There should be virtually no human interference and NO commercial interference in this wilderness area.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 311 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I prefer Alternative B in your management plan for the Olympic Wilderness in the Olympic National Park.

Comments: Please support alternative B in your management plan for the Olympic Wilderness in the Olympic National Park.

Correspondence ID: 312 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 07:06:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative B is the best for wilderness and should be the plan.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 313 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes, but limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act and minimizes human impact

Topic Question 3:

prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 314 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following modifications as noted in the answer to Question 3.

Topic Question 3:

- a. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail, campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. Confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 315 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
please see my comment below

Topic Question 2:
please see my comment below

Topic Question 3:
please see my comment below

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 316 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Good range of choices.

Topic Question 2:
I like that you are asking for comments at all.

Topic Question 3:

We should not even be discussing the increase of motor vehicles, new structures or additional trails that might disturb the wildlife.

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	317	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	private citizen Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes, but the only alternative that meets wilderness designation is Alternative B. Wilderness quality in the park should be maintained. There is so little wilderness left in the lower 48 states, that no more should be sacrificed.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B that are compatible with wilderness designation. Motorized vehicles of any kind should be prohibited including helicopters except for emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

New structures should be prohibited. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail. This, of course is compatible with wilderness designation. It follows that natural processes should operate unimpeded.

Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Finally confine nature trails to the front-country; do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness. Once in the wilderness, people should not be bombarded by human modifications.

Topic Question 3:

See question 2 above

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	318	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Correspondence ID: 319 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to save the wilderness from destruction. I don't to see any trees cut down because of development. I don't want to see the habitats for the wildlife to be destroyed either. When you do this the animals that are endangered might be extinct and there would be no greenery in the forest.

Correspondence ID: 320 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

As Wilderness, this area in Olympia National Park, needs to be considered carefully !

Topic Question 3:

I think the option to leave the lightest footprint is the best. Why ? Because throughout the Pacific NorthWest, forests have been cut to the bone. I realize there is alot of secondary regrowth but the amount of primary forest is in the single digits, I believe. We, as humans, have to learn to do better and care more. Originally people thought, naively, that the forests would go on forever. We know better now and need to do better now. There must be some "wild" left, and few really wild places exist anywhere anymore.

Comments: We don't need to cut every old tree, 'manage' all the wildlife, harvest every resource. We need to leave some, alot really, for the coming generations and need to plan for their to be a rich tapestry of life in our parks. The wildlife, both plants and animals, are voiceless. So I am raising my voice to speak for them. Wilderness is by definition "wild". Wilderness can't co-exist with development or is ceases...to be.

We have cut, harvested, mined, paved, built, fished and hunted nearly every acre. Please, please leave a small bit really wild. Please.

Correspondence ID: 321 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

It offers a wide range of options,including B,which I strongly support.

Comments: I support option B,keeping human impacts in this wilderness as low as possible,including as much as possible allowing humans access only via foot.Natural process should be the means for repair of environmental damage done by humans.Except where human habitat is threatened by them,wildfires in this wilderness should be allowed to burn themselves out naturally,and the area should be off limits to logging and to mining.

Correspondence ID: 322 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support Alternative B - this is the only one that truly meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

I particularly support the following parts of this Alternative:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 323 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B.

Comments: 1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 324 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and

modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Please see the above in question 1.

Topic Question 3:

Please see the above in question 1.

Comments: Please see the above in question 1.

Correspondence ID:	325	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I vote for wilderness: Option B.				

Correspondence ID:	326	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:

I like Alternative B which reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness

Topic Question 3:

Prohibit motorized equipment and equipment except in emergencies.
Ensure research and administrative activities adhere to no motorized equipment.

Prohibit new structures which distract from wilderness character.

Allow nature to take it's course with very limited human interference.

No highly developed trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	327	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I believe it is important to have areas that are protected from development both residential or commercial with limited access to people. The least impact possible from humans.

Correspondence ID: 328 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 329 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Option B is the only alternative that meets the objectives of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B, including:

- a. Prohibits the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensures that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. Prohibits new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. Leaves cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. Allows natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limits human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. Confines nature trails to the frontcountry. Does not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	330	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes, including comments below.					

Topic Question 2:

Wilderness should be wilderness unmarked by human influence. Alternative B most closely fits the definition of true wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

See comments below.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	331	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Only one option Alternative B meets the standards set forth by the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the best choice as it minimizes human interaction and impact on Olympic National Park.

Comments: As a former resident of the Olympic Peninsula during the 1970's and early 80's I am particularly concerned about Olympic National Park, which I have visited and hiked. I support Alternative B of the Wilderness Stewardship Plan with some modifications. Restricting the use of motorized vehicles including helicopters only in the case of an emergency. This would include researchers not using helicopters but getting in the old-fashioned way by hiking. I support the prohibition of new structures in the Park. I am for letting natural processes evolve unimpeded. Let wilderness be wilderness and adhere to the spirit and the letter of the law.

Correspondence ID: 332 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, but Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 2:
Alternatives B and C are an improvement over the current policy.

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control. See my comments below for fuller details.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 333 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
See Comments.

Topic Question 3:
See Comments.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibition of the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies and ensuring that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibition of new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leaving cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allowing natural processes to operate unimpeded and limiting human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confining nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	334	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

NO. Alternative B is the only option that minimizes human impacts, preserves solitude and creates a possible wilderness experience.

Topic Question 3:
natural processes must be allowed to operate unimpeded. restoration activities conducted by natural processes minimizing human control.

Comments: Prohibit motorized equipment such as helicopters except in an emergency.

Prohibit new structures, installations, development unless necessary to protect wilderness.

Leave cultural resources alone.

Limit human engineered restoration activities to repairing trails or campsite damage.

Confine nature trails to the frontcountry.

Correspondence ID:	335	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, many of us believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	336	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Please see below in Comments.				

Topic Question 2:

Not too much- -See below in comments.

Topic Question 3:

I urge you to adopt Alternative B, with changes as noted below in Comments.

Comments: I strongly support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	337	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				

Affiliation:**Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

Alternatives A and D, but especially D, are not at all in accordance with the Wilderness Act and should not be considered...

Please see my answer to question 2, below...

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this issue.

Correspondence ID: 338 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

Yes. I am a nature photographer, and have photographed the area. I want it to return to the most pristine state possible, while allowing for non-damaging, non-invasive use of the lands.

Topic Question 2:

The range of options

Topic Question 3:

I support plan B with modifications that:

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except in emergencies. And

make sure that research and other administration functions adhere to these rules. I've been in other wilderness parks where the administration's use of mechanized travel was very disruptive.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. I do NOT want to see buildings, trail shelters, etc.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration, such as repairing trail or campsite damage.

Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the wilderness. I do not want to hike into the wilderness, and have to photoshop out interpretive signs, shelters, kiosks, etc.

Comments: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on these options. Option B seems the best, with the modifications outlined above in question 3.

My father was an interpretive naturalist, who designed over 30 parks and nature centers. He entered the landscape on his own, making many notes on what he saw and heard. His goal was to create plans that would allow as many people as possible to see what he saw, hear what he heard, and feel what he felt, without dramatically altering the experience he had when he was alone. I believe this is a good guideline for any wilderness park management. It implies that there are limits beyond which we should not go, or the purpose of preserving the wilderness is compromised.

Correspondence ID:	339	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: ??				

Topic Question 2:
Only B is maybe ok with some changes

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: This place where I have hike several times must remain wild.

Correspondence ID:	340	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:
They continue protection

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	341	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	Yes				

Topic Question 2:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 342 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, option B with the modifications and clarifications below in response to Q3.

Topic Question 2:
I like that option B protects the wilderness.

Topic Question 3:
Yes, these modifications and clarifications that strengthen wilderness protection:
1. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
2. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
3. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
4. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 343 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reduce the physical human imprint in Olympic National Park. Humans are expanding everywhere and our parks deserve to remain as wild as possible so some of us can enjoy nature the way it is supposed to be...natural.

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 344 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	345	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

I support Alternatives B and C with a preference for B and the following changes:

Emphasis on management as Wilderness with strong protections and prohibition of motorized equipment except for bonafide emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Management should allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Artificial engineered restoration activities should be limited to site-specific modification or restoration such as protecting wildlife, providing "bear wires", repairing trails or campsite damage.

Comments: The Olympic National Park is a national treasure that must be protected. Since most of the park is designated as wilderness those maximum protections should be adhered to. I do not believe new structures should be allowed in the wilderness portion of the park. It is important to provide amenities in the portion of the park that is not wilderness, but those amenities should be of low impact and consistent with a natural environment. Interpretative trails, concessions and traffic management should emphasize the natural wonders of the park rather than those of a "tourist trap."

Correspondence ID:	346	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				

Affiliation:**Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

No, Even Plan B is not comprehensive enough to preserve the Olympic Wilderness as true wilderness for generations to come. It should include additional protections and should be the plan adopted for the ONP.

Topic Question 2:

Plan A -do nothing differently- is clearly inadequate given the adverse changes to the ONP over the years (see Comments below). Plans C and D also provide inadequate protection and should be rejected.

Topic Question 3:

Plan B should include the following elements:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in grave emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I lived in Seattle in the 1970's and did a great deal of hiking and camping. One of the magnificent places to travel near and through at the time was the ONP. It was rugged; it was largely unspoiled; it was an extraordinary wilderness area.

Two years ago I returned intending to awe my Atlanta-raised daughters with the extraordinary wonders of this area. Instead, I was staggered by the extensive despoiling of the upper Olympic Peninsula. Yes, much of it lay outside the park boundaries but even inside the ONP the changes were extensive and none for the better. It was and is heart-breaking.

The ONP is one of the great special and unique areas on this small planet. As an extraordinary place it needs extraordinary protection. Plan B should be adopted but only with the addition of very stringent levels of protection from human activity and intervention.

It does not need to become yet another gem of the earth overrun by humanity. I would gladly endure the additional restrictions for its long-term preservation.

Thank you for allowing me to make comments.

Correspondence ID:	347	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

There is a sufficient range of alternatives, however I feel alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness act. "B" inimizizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control. I support the approach proposed in Alternative B assuming it is modified to include the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	348	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Fewer people encouraged to trample the wilderness area is primary. Removal of old structures and prohibition of new (shelters/cabins) will support the intent of creating a WILD place that is safe from human disruption.

Topic Question 2:

Changes to the current policies are necessary. However, the designation wilderness area suggests LESS not more human intervention in the natural systems. The only option offered that reduces the human impact/presence is B which reduces human impact.

Topic Question 3:

Human intervention is generally short sighted (human life span) and therefore ineffective. Let nature take care of itself.

Comments: Major misjudgments have been made about the capacity of the Olympic Peninsula ecosystem to recover from clear cut logging and other extreme projects. Many of the other national parks I have visited are incredibly stressed by people driving and walking on every inch of ground.

Alternative B is the only option offered which protects the land 'we the people' have designated as wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	349	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

no

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

I would add the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	350	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: An alternative with more wilderness protection is needed.				

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	351	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Pax Christi Florida Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes

Topic Question 2:

Gives us options to consider

Topic Question 3:

Yes, see below.

Comments: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	352	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:	
---------------------	--

Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:
------------------------	-------------------

I support Alternative B and the prohibition of motor vehicles and additional development in wilderness areas, except as needed for emergencies. I support keeping wilderness areas wild and allowing nature to prevail over human-made activities and structures. Thank you.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	353	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:	
---------------------	--

Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
------------------------	--

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 354 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Ms. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Do not allow hunting, trapping, baiting and or any other kind of wild life killing in our parks areas.

Correspondence ID: 355 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 08:00:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

There is one which allows what I feel is essential, which is to get motorized vehicles especially ATVs, snowmobiles, helicopters and the like which are noisy, polluting and destructive of the environment.

Topic Question 3:

I would like it spelled out that NO corporation EVER can "develop" this wilderness be it for exploiting oil, minerals, lumber or any other resources or for any other reasons.

Comments: I strongly support the management approach of Alternative B which would prohibit the use of ALL motorized equipment and motorized transport except for use in true emergencies INCLUDING ensuring that all research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules so they can't be "stretched" over time.

This is a beautiful area - I lived for a number of years in British Columbia and saw the Olympic Wilderness in various seasons - and you need to OPPOSE any further development including construction of all kinds unless ESSENTIAL to protect this untrammelled wilderness.

Existing cultural resources should be left undisturbed and maintenance activities should be limited to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Nature is NOT static and we need to allow it to prevail even if they are threatened by natural processes.

I have visited many, many parks and wildernesses on four continents and I find the tacky American "interpretive" trails offensive. Something out of a bad Boy Scout movie. Have online access to information (why destroy more trees and poison more water by printing brochures) and let people explore the wilderness on their own with the respect it deserves.

Correspondence ID:	356	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	357	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 08:02:29				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: I believe we humans must take care of our natural world. It is where we live and gives us life. So much has been ruined and what is left needs preserving for future generations. I have four great grandchildren and I want them and theirs to have what God created for us. This world is damaged by economical greed and competition for power along with consumer demands.				

Topic Question 2:
All are needed and more.

Comments: Change can happen though education, publicity, use of all technical venues people are in constant use to spread the word, getting the voters to support candidates in power or not depending on their record and belief, the silent majority must step up and stand for what is best in our natural world and for our life. Urgency must be stressed since the effects of destruction are already in motion.

Correspondence ID: 358 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 359 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 360 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support for the following:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 361 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
see below

Topic Question 2:
see below

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: Along with others who are interested in conservation, I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 362 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 3:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 363 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 08:09:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I implore you to choose Alternative B. Reduce the human imprint!

Correspondence ID: 364 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
It seems that there are enough alternatives with B being the best one.

Topic Question 2:

Use Alternative B for the best outcome for maintaining wilderness in Olympic National Park

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 365 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I was just in Olympic National Park a few weeks ago and I believe the only alternative needed is Alternative 'B'.

Topic Question 2:

I like how Alternative 'B' protects the wilderness, it's habitats and species for current and future generations. It's great how Alternative 'B' maintains the park and it's wilderness in the same condition it has always been in for millennia. So much human impact is fragmenting and thus destroying original parkland wilderness and Alternative 'B' will protect that.

Topic Question 3:

See Below:

Comments:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 366 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. See comment.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including prohibiting the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Research activities and other administrative functions must adhere to these rules also.

I support prohibiting new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

I support leaving cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

I support allowing natural processes to operate unimpeded. Human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures must be limited.

I support confining nature trails to the front country and not including highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 367 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Actually, it appears that the range is too broad. Any alternative that doesn't adhere to the specifics of The Wilderness Act should not be considered.

Topic Question 2:

I'm only in favor of alternative B.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.

Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	368	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

PLEASE support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: PLEASE support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 369 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 370 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I believe that alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience)

Comments: I think that, to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration, such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes, with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 371 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Mr. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Very good thoughts

Topic Question 2:
please consider

Topic Question 3:

think of our world

Comments: just do the right thing for everyone

Correspondence ID: 372 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support Alternative B with the above changes.

Correspondence ID: 373 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 374 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Keep nature the same, natural, untouched by man for the sake of the plants & animals. Allow only a few vistors yearly and no motorized vehicle. If something isnt done to preserve what we have left it will be destroyed by over population of man. There is no doubt about it.

Correspondence ID: 375 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Although there are a number of alternatives, with some being improvement over the current plan, there is none that fully addresses and includes some key issues facing the Wilderness,

Topic Question 2:

I generally support the management approach described in Alternative B with additional provisions and modifications listed in question 3.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. These provisions are needed:

- a. prohibit use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character and are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where threatened by natural processes, allow natural processes to prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	376	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

I support Alternative B subject to the amendments outlined below

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	377	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes, Alternative B with some changes.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B with some changes. See below.

Topic Question 3:

Yes.

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules. If people want noise and destruction, let them do it at home.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	378	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

They offer a path forward but Alternative B is the best option with some modifications

Topic Question 3:

Yes in Alternative B 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	379	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				

Affiliation:**Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

There should be one additional: the removal of ALL human activity from the Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park.

Topic Question 2:

I see alternative B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness, as the only option of those provided

Topic Question 3:

Removal of ALL human activity from the Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park.

Comments: Wild places are disappearing quickly, worldwide. They should be left alone by humans and allowed to carry on their biodiversity as nature intended. This is an opportunity to do just that.

Correspondence ID: 380 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 381 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** May,14,2014 08:22:29**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

Variety

Comments: Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a

minimum of human control.

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 382 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It is my opinion that wilderness should be maintained as wilderness with a minimalist approach to this territory.

Topic Question 3:

I would go with option B with the caveat that the man-made contrivances, such as shelters, not be allowed; and that minimal be done in terms of trail maintenance.

No motorized equipment should be allowed. . .and "nature knows best" approach should be the goal.

Comments: "In Wilderness is the Preservation of Life"

I think Emerson said this. . .and it's what I believe.

Correspondence ID: 383 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The range of alternatives provides enough starting positions.

Topic Question 2:

I generally support the management approach described in Alternative B, but would modify it in the ways described in my answer to Question 3.

Topic Question 3:

I support a modified Alternative B that includes the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	384	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Comments: May 14, 2014

Park Planners;

I would like to voice my support for the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.
- This option should best support and protect the Wilderness character of Olympic National Park. Thank you for the opportunity to comment during the planning process.

Sincerely,
Bob Seibert
NPS Ranger, retired
70 Brajenka Lane
Bozeman, MT 59715

Correspondence ID:	385	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 08:29:14				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes, for the most part (see Comment below).					

Topic Question 2:

The option of reducing (ideally minimizing) human imprint. After all, this IS wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

I feel very strongly about reducing/prohibiting structures and development (including developed trails, campsites

and "interpretive centers") and absolutely excluding motorized access/vehicles/equipment (except in TRUE emergencies). Please see Comment below.

Comments: To Whom It May Concern at the National Park Service:

I am writing to register my comments regarding the management plan for the Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park (ONP).

Since 876,400 acres (95%) of ONP is designated wilderness, the highest priority of the approved management plan should be to maintain the Wilderness as true wilderness. I believe that final plan should "reduce physical imprint" on the Wilderness, which is the proposed management approach of the National Park Services Alternative B. However, I believe the following items need to be more strongly emphasized in the plan:

No administrative, recreational, cultural, research, or other activities (other than those related to emergency situations) should take priority over maintaining the Wilderness as such and any research, cultural, or administrative functions need to strictly adhere to rules of maintaining the wilderness character.

Maintaining wilderness means that motorized vehicles and equipment; new structures, installations and developments; and highly developed trails and roads should be prohibited. Not just limited, which is subject to wide interpretation, but prohibited. There is no need to introduce artifice into wilderness, and there are many other developed parks in the NPS in which citizens can satisfy their need for motorized and recreational schemes. Those who want to experience wilderness need to understand (and many already do) that they must respect and not manipulate it.

Development of any kind of trails should be confined to localized, peripheral areas of the Wilderness. Any activities required to protect or restore areas or remove existing structures should necessarily minimally disturb the wilderness character.

I hope you will take these items into consideration when developing the draft environmental impact statement for the plan. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ann Marie Connor

Correspondence ID:	386	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

This is sufficient. With that said I do not believe Alternative D should not be allowed as an option. Alternative D is abominable with no respectable aspect. This Alternative will destroy the Olympic Wilderness!

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the best option and the superior choice.

Alternative C has merit, but my concern is the term "manipulations". Too much manipulation can lead to extreme changes in the ecosystem unique to the Olympic Wilderness. In essence, altering the pristine environment that it is in currently.

There is nothing to like in Alternative D. It is irresponsible and reckless to offer as an option. This should not be offered as an option!

Topic Question 3:
I ardently support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 387 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 I support alternative "B"

Topic Question 2:
 I support alternative "B"

Topic Question 3:
 I support alternative "B"
 Please see below in comments

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 388 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B maintains the provisions of the Wilderness Act, which is good.

Topic Question 3:

Option B should emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 389 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B is for me!

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is for me!

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is for me!

Comments: Alternative B is for me!

Correspondence ID: 390 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I believe the wild beauty of the park would best be protected by alternative B. I don't think you need other alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

Wilderness areas need protection from human carelessness and lack of consideration of natural processes, in other words, the popularity of a wilderness area will kill it.

Topic Question 3:

Don't bow to the whims of the campers, RV users, people that want more trails for motorized vehicles, bikes, boats or other junk that humans love to have. Keep it wild for the real inhabitants of the wilderness, the animals!

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 391 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative A does absolutely nothing while Alternative D would, more than likely, cause more damage than is already being done. Alternative C might be possible but it would mean more money would have to be spent on

manpower to protect the park(s).

Topic Question 3:

Our parks need our protection but people need to be able to visit and have some type(s) of recreational activities.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 392 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I prefer option B- leaving wilderness alone as much as is humanly possible. No motorized vehicles.

Topic Question 3:

Always first consider lessening human impact on nature to preserve and protect for future generations.

Comments: Please consider option B

Correspondence ID: 393 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: U.S. Taxpayer Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Considering there has historically been little in the way of a plan, the alternatives show welcome initiative. This would be an expected range of possible management and policy initiatives.

Topic Question 2:

I like the B and C alternatives as they look to preserving true wilderness and natural processes. B: the alternative that actively reduces the human imprint, is by far the most attractive and responsible stewardship of this amazing park, the ONP.

Topic Question 3:

I would expect that choice B would include such things as no motorized vehicles except for emergencies; no new structures allowed to be built; the allowance of natural processes to be the prime force of any change and finally that nature trails would be confined to the front country, preserving the delicate balance of a truly wild place.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 394 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes. Four alternatives are satisfactory.

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives B and C are an improvement over the current policy.

Topic Question 3:

No. The range of alternatives is acceptable as is.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B. However, I recommend including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains and are expendable.
- c. Leave cultural resources undisturbed. Where they are threatened by natural processes, let the natural processes prevail.
- d. Allow natural environmental processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. Confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	395	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

My feeling is there should be more emphasis on minimizing human impact on the wilderness areas.

Topic Question 2:

I like the fact that plan "B" comes closest to achieving the goal of protecting the Wilderness areas.

Topic Question 3:

I would make sure that any man made structures were kept to a bare minimum, allowing only those that are necessary for the park service protection and preservation of the wilderness areas.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	396	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 397 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

Please:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments: Please:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 398 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 399 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

Yes, I think for now there are sufficient ways to reduce environmental waste.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 400 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Further study

Topic Question 3:
Yes

Comments: . Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you! Let's keep the Olympics wild!

Correspondence ID:	401	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	402	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	403	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 404 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 08:57:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
I like option B.

Topic Question 3:
Choose Option B

Comments: Dear National Park Service,

Please choose Alternative B. It is most in line with the Wilderness Act. Also, do not allow helicopters in the Park, except for life threatening emergencies. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scott Weldon

Correspondence ID: 405 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I essentially support alternative plan b and any additional aspect of this plan which would minimize human imprint

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 406 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: USACE Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 08:59:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I believe that your EIS addresses the alternatives adequately

Topic Question 2:
They relate to the existing conditions

Topic Question 3:

I feel there should be more emphasis on climate change and adverse affects to natural plant communities

Comments: I am in support of Alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 407 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 408 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
NOT REALLY. Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness

Topic Question 2:

Only that there IS one that actually has something to do with the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I'm really tired of the "recreation industry" treating America's wilderness as though it's just there to run dirt vehicles through. When I want to get away from modern congestion, I want to get AWAY. I want to go somewhere that has NO racket of internal combustion engines, no stupid, selfish yee-haws wrecking nature as though the whole world is their little demolition-derby playground. I want to be out in peace and quiet.

Humans have created a literal stress incubator in our industrialized lifestyle. We should preserve some places where a person who seeks quiet can get away from the noise.

Oh, and - - we are NOT the only species on the planet, even if we do act like it. Some of us appreciate seeing non-

human life forms outside of a zoo.

Correspondence ID: 409 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 410 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 411 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
alternative B is the best one, with the changes listed in question 3

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 412 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 413 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I do not have another alternative

Topic Question 2:
Addressing saving the wilderness

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments: N/A

Correspondence ID: 414 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	415	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	416	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	417	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:					

Please support the management approach described in Alternative B (an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness) including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	418	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

The only viable option that stays true to the wilderness protection act is option B, and then only with modifications described below.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B needs following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 419 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

There should be an alternative that extends alternative B and reinforces the wilderness provisions in the Wilderness Act.

Specifically, The National Park Service should make clear that - - in wilderness - - the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, are prohibited. All research and administrative functions will adhere to these rules.

NPS should also make clear that buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character. The Wilderness Act is clear that new structures, installations, and developments are prohibited unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

NPS should make clear that managers will leave cultural resources undisturbed, and allow natural processes to operate unimpeded.

NPS should make clear that human-engineered restorations will be limited to minor site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Finally, NPS should confine nature trails to the frontcountry, outside Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

(See above) Alternative B should be more specific to the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

(Please see question 1) Yes, change Alternative B according to the improvements above.

Comments: Wilderness is exceedingly rare and important.

We're watching the wilderness system increasingly managed to be tamed and domesticated. More helicopters overhead, more motorized vehicles on the ground, with agencies seeking more chainsaws, generators, backhoes, artificial watering holes, visitors centers, permanent outfitters' camps, climbing anchors, hiking cables, weather stations, border security observation and listening devices, and on and on. Just outside the borders to wilderness are other threats that significantly reduce its wildness, more development every day: proposed mining, cell towers, wires, oil exploration, and ATV and snowmobile roads. In the last two years. We've witnessed a hostile U.S. House of Representatives, which has voted repeatedly to weaken and develop wilderness, often with misleading titles like "The Sportsman's Heritage Act."

It's a misunderstanding of the letter - - and spirit - - of the Wilderness Act. And something more, something unconscious. It's a latent mistrust of wild nature or a deep-seated human drive to tame our most remote ecosystems. Indeed, all this rejection of the wild now has a name, the Anthropocene, the so-called Age of Man, when humans are in charge of everything, when there is no wildness left, and no boundaries to the manipulations of everything, everywhere.

If that sounds ominous, it is. We should know better. This arrogance runs against "the idea of wilderness." That's

Wallace Stegner's term, his belief that these lands are "a genetic reserve, a scientific yardstick by which we may measure the world in its natural balance against the world in its man-made imbalance."

Stegner was prophetic - - as were the authors of the Wilderness Act. And, of course, they're not the first to speak this warning. As long as human beings have told stories, we've been warned of overreach, what the Greeks called hubris. The Greeks believed that tragedy strikes us when humans think they as powerful as the gods. Don't like the Greeks? Try the Old Testament story of Noah or John the Baptist, or the German legend of Faust. And, today, you don't have to look much further than Darth Vader to find a story in our lexicon about a good man gone to the dark side.

Let's re-commit the National Park Service to the wilderness ideal, that this remnant of the American frontier on the Olympic Peninsula should remain wild, and its managers should uphold the Wilderness Act's imperative: all management should maintain or enhance the Olympic Wilderness's wilderness character.

Correspondence ID:	420	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would say it is too broad a range. As I see it, wilderness should prohibit human influence as much as possible, allowing nature to thrive and maintain its own balanced ecosystem.

See below.

Topic Question 2:

I only like the alternative presented in B, and provide my reasons below.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, I would add several provisions to Alternative B, and outline them below.

Comments: I wholeheartedly support the management approach described in Alternative B however it should include the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	421	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

yes

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications listed in Question 3.

Alternative C could be better than the current policy.

Topic Question 3:

Re: Alternative B:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	422	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes the alternatives are sufficient.				

Topic Question 2:

I like that the public can still have access. I think though of my handicap mother in law who still travels at 94 yet needs amenities wherever it is that we go. So a variety of back country recreation is not necessarily what she would do but to find a place to stay overnight like hotel, cabins.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	423	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 424 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
You should have an alternative that focuses on an untrammelled wilderness, in accordance with the 1964 Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:
See below.

Comments: I generally support the management approach described in Alternative B, but only with the following provisions and modifications:

1. We should prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
2. We should prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
3. We should leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes should prevail.
4. We should allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. We should confine nature trails to the front country. Do not allow highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness itself.

Correspondence ID: 425 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B ONLY!!!

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B ONLY!!

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B ONLY!!

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 426 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Enough to get a feel for how best to proceed.

Topic Question 3:
I think less is more...the wilderness doesn't need our help to take care of itself, it simply needs us to protect it from as much human activity as possible in order to do what it has been doing for thousands of years. If all land management decisions are measured against this simple principal everything should work out fine.

Comments: Restoring existing facilities is fine, but expanding them should only be done when absolutely needed. A mild expansion of trails is fine but, don't go nuts. Limit access/use of motorized vehicles in the park with the exception of emergencies/preventing emergencies.

Correspondence ID: 427 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: "If future generations are to remember us with gratitude rather than contempt, we must leave them something more than the miracles of technology. We must leave them a glimpse of the world as it was in the beginning, not just after we got through with it."
- President Lyndon B. Johnson, on signing the Wilderness Act of 1964

President Obama, most of the Senate and Congress and Governors are Christians. Christianity teaches that God created the natural world (garden of Eden) to last forever in the pure form that it was created. It is the responsibility of present day Christians to adhere to what their God's original plan was. Christianity also believes Jesus will return one day. Jesus will want to see the leaders honoring God's original plan.

Correspondence ID: 428 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 429 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I believe that it is a sufficient range.

Topic Question 2:
Some do take the environmental factors into consideration

Topic Question 3:
I believe that option B is the best option for protecting the area and doing less harm.

Comments: I urge you to vote for option B. thank you

Correspondence ID: 430 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes I like option B

Topic Question 2:
nothing

Comments: Less impact on the natural environment...

Correspondence ID: 431 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Comments: . I strongly support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of

Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 432 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Ms. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 09:37:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

I prefer Alternative B as it is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

Include the following:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 433 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 434 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B of the proposed ONC management plan for the Olympic Wilderness, as it appears to be the only alternative that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act. I support Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 435 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, there is a range of alternatives to the proposed Stewardship Plan. Please see the Comments section for my suggestion as to alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

The fact that there are alternatives gives you a choice of options. Some, obviously, are better than others.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the best choice, but it should be modified. My opinion about changes to Alternative B is shown below in the Comments section.

Comments: I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 436 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	437	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 09:50:10				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: yes				

Topic Question 2:
gives a good number of options

Topic Question 3:
I would support Alternative B for best protection of the wilderness character of Olympic.

Comments: I support Alternative B. Prohibition of motor vehicles, the building of structures and any type of development is the best way to protect the wilderness in Olympic National Park. Allow natural processes to take their course and refrain from constructing high use trails in the back country. I have back packed in Olympic National Park four times and love its wild nature. I would hate to see that character dismantled. Alternative B is the only alternative that is consistent with the wilderness act.

Correspondence ID:	438	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 439 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
That there is a No Action alternative.

Topic Question 3:
If no action is out then Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Alternative B: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 440 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Please keep the Olympics wild.1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Remember, comments are due by May 17 (Saturday) and should be sent via the internet:

<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=58015>

Thank you! Let's keep the Olympics wild!

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	441	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Directing question					

Topic Question 2:

Leading question

Topic Question 3:

See comments

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 442 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes. or take out the ones that allow further encroachment of humans into the park

Topic Question 2:
only one that is moving forward is B:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: humans are destroying every corner of the planet. what few areas that are left that are relatively pristine need all the protection from our species they can get.

Correspondence ID: 443 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
Variety.

Topic Question 3:
I alternative B:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the listed provisions and modifications.

Correspondence ID:	444	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I am a great believer in keeping wilderness, wild.

Correspondence ID:	445	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	Yes				

Topic Question 2:
B

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 446 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
I like only B

Comments: Minimize the effect of a human element to preserve the wilderness as it should be.

Correspondence ID: 447 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I think that the range is sufficient.

Topic Question 2:

I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

It is good to prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
Prohibiting new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.
Please leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded by limiting human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Also,confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

These are the things that I believe will help to preserve our wild places.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 448 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 449 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Catholic Church Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
YES

Topic Question 2:
Clear and concise!

Topic Question 3:
NO

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 450 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 451 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The range seems sufficient to me, and it has been well thought out and organized.

Topic Question 2:

They are specific as to which things would be affected in each case.

Topic Question 3:

I would prefer alternative D, which emphasizes public use and recreation more. As an avid equestrian, I cherish the trails we have to ride in this country, especially in the wilderness areas. I also appreciate the opportunities for camping, hiking, and fishing. I do not favor restricting or eliminating the public's opportunities to access and enjoy our lands.

I did not see any references to extracting natural resources. Would oil, gas or coal be accessible in these areas? If so, there should be some management techniques in place to protect the environment. Also, would harvesting dead timber to help prevent wildfires be allowed? If so, how would that be managed?

Comments: My family has done camping, backpacking, hiking, and fishing for years when our children were growing up. We were in the Yellowstone area the year of the fires. We have backpacked the Grand Tetons, hiked the Grand Canyon, Mesa Verde, the Four Corners area, Smoky Mountain Park and the Indian reservations in many of these areas. Since the late 90s I have enjoyed endurance riding in many of our states and in Canada. As a retired teacher, I remember teaching about our great country and all the beautiful places to see. I take great pride in our resources and our freedom to enjoy them. I appreciate what you are doing and thank you for the chance to give my thoughts. I hope they helped.

Correspondence ID:	452	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	453	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				

Affiliation:**Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 2:

Alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, however, I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	454	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Alternative B is good. We should limit human impact and keep 100% wld if possible.				

Correspondence ID:	455	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes, if Alternative B is strengthened.				

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

I support Alternative B but it needs the following provisions and modifications:

Motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, should be prohibited except for in emergencies. New structures should be prohibited.

Cultural resources should remain undisturbed except by natural processes.

Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite

damage or removing unnecessary structures.
Do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Strictly adhere to the Wilderness Act.

Correspondence ID: 456 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Prohibit trails or roads that would enable invasive species, such as garlic mustard and honeysuckle, from finding root.
Prohibit trails and roads that would enable invasive birds, such as cowbirds, from invading native bird nests.
Limit noise and light pollution.
Inclusion of recycling bins.
What are the consequences of littering?
Control of potential fire hazards from camp fires and cigarette butts.

Topic Question 2:

Prohibition of the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Topic Question 3:

Controlled burns in appropriate areas.

When fires are controlled, and abundance of 'fuel' for fires builds up. How can this potential fire feeder be controlled? Sometimes a forest fire does more good by burning. Some trees depend on fire to begin new growth

Comments: Human invasion into wildlife areas are placed in harms way when forest fires occur. Then the people become upset when they observe animals such as wolves or bears close to their homes. I believe it is essential to educate people on the fact that when they move to areas where such animals live they must accept the potential hazards. They also need to recognize they should not bring invasive non native plants into their landscaping. Roads tend to interfere with wildlife habitat creating hazards for those animals who are attempting to 'move from room to room'. Consider habitats and wildlife trails before building a road. Build bridges or tunnels to assist wildlife in their habitat.

Correspondence ID: 457 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	458	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, and Alternative B with modifications as set out below is the superior action plan, and should be adopted with the modifications as recommended below.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is preferred alternative. It meets the scoping requirements for wilderness management in the Pacific Northwest.

Topic Question 3:

1. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as trail shelters and cabins detract from wilderness character.
3. Cultural resources should remain undisturbed. Where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
4. Natural processes should operate unimpeded. Human-engineered restoration activities should be limited to minor, site-specific restoration activities such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. Interactive and similar interpretative nature trails should be confined to to the front country. Highly developed or interpretive trails should not be developed in the Wilderness back country.

Comments: I strongly support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the provisions and modifications set out above.

Correspondence ID: 459 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

Yes a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Comments: I lived in the NW for 15 years and some of my best memories are of this park in its natural state

Correspondence ID: 460 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
This is a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

The Park Service has identified four alternatives: A) no action; B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation opportunities.

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

There are no specific elements I feel should be changed.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 461 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B is the only solution that works with Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 462 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 463 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I think that Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience)

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Please support Alternative B for the Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park.

- a. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	464	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Ms. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would suggest that you confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	465	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, although I believe the alternative I prefer needs some modifications.

Topic Question 2:

They cover a broad range from doing nothing to more invasive actions.

Topic Question 3:

Please see my comments below.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country; do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	466	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support :				

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	467	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Not entirely. I think the alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness needs to be modified

(or another added) to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

I do like that two of the alternatives would be an improvement over the current policy, but only one would meet the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizing human impacts and preserving solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience.

Topic Question 3:

I think the alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness needs to be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control. More specifically, I'd recommend the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	468	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Mr. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	469	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 470 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please see my comments below.

Topic Question 2:
Please see my comments below.

Topic Question 3:
Please see my summary comments below. Thank you.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 471 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

1. I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I would like to see the plan B adopted

Correspondence ID:	472	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I feel that alternative B is the best one with certain modifications that I address below in my response to question 3.

Topic Question 2:

I feel that alternative B with the suggestions I address in my answer to question the below is the best alternative.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 473 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 10:54:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Satisfactory.

Topic Question 2:
I like alternatives B and C.

Topic Question 3:
Yes. See comments.

Comments: I prefer the management approach outlined in Alternative B. I would especially and specifically like to see that no large-scale, human eco-engineering be allowed, including the exclusion of highly developed trails in the backcountry. Furthermore, motorized vehicles/equipment and new buildings/development should be PROHIBITED, as was and is always the intention of the Wilderness Act.

Correspondence ID: 474 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 10:54:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

It appears that all action alternatives hedge toward allowing human interference in Wilderness Areas. Any element suggesting human interference, influence or manipulation of Wilderness should be eliminated.

Comments: Wilderness character cannot be preserved in perpetuity if humans, in perpetuity, keep tampering with the natural landscape and function of the ONP Wilderness Area. Untrammeled is a more all-encompassing word than untrammeled. I fear modern land managers fail to understand, appreciate and respect the distinction between the terms. The authors of the Wilderness Act chose the term untrammeled because they believed the very definition of wilderness meant that an area is totally free to function at its own pace, like a horse being allowed to run "untrammeled" or unshackled. I urge the decision-makers to review the etymology of the word untrammeled as it considers this and all wilderness management proposals. In fact, the term management and wilderness, logically speaking, do not belong in the same sentence as wilderness excepting only the management or reigning in of human activities that defy the definition of untrammeled and thus, the essence of wilderness.

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Honor the Wilderness Act by:

- 1) prohibiting the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Also, ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- 2) prohibiting the addition of new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protect an untrammeled wilderness. Amenities such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- 3) please leaving cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes should and will prevail. In fact, the decay of historic (not those added recently and illegally, since Wilderness designation) human structures and installations serves well to highlight the enduring and renewable nature of the surrounding wilderness.

4) allowing natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or primitive campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

5) confining nature trails to the frontcountry and do not include even mildly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness. Wilderness is not a place where one person "interprets" his or her "official" take on its meaning and essence. Rather, wilderness is a place or area where individuals experience, for themselves, the wildness of nature. Interpretation, via signage or agency officials is best conducted in an interpretative center or classroom. Verbally communicated wilderness education, on the other hand, can be conducted in Wilderness Areas in the presence of "willing recipients." The distinction between the terms "interpretation" and "education" must be understood and appreciated. The teaching of basic and scientifically sound biological processes and relationships, geology, and other natural sciences is certainly appropriate, where desired by wilderness visitors. To elaborate on the distinction between wilderness interpretation and education are the following examples.

Interpretation Examples

To offer or interject a personal or "official agency" perspective (i.e., interpretation) on the management of wilderness is to:

• presume wilderness "needs" management by human beings. This presumption is an opinion, not a scientific fact.
• usurp the self held wilderness perceptions of the visitors being addressed
• violate, when offered during a wilderness outing, the opportunity of its visitors to experience the purity of wilderness (an experience most appreciated when alone and absent distractions) and to develop one's personal perceptions on wilderness

Education Examples

To offer educational informal is to:

• provide only scientifically sound facts about the biological functions of nature
• provide only scientifically sound facts about the geological character of the area
• provide only scientifically sound facts about the wilderness environment being experienced

These are just a few examples to sharpen the distinction between the words interpretation and education. Human opinions dominate interpretation and scientific facts dominate (or should dominate) education.

In simple conclusion, Keep the Wild in Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	475	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	yes				

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 476 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 477 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I believe the range you have offered is sufficient.

Topic Question 2:

What I like about Alternative B is that it preserves a large area of wilderness just as it was before humans came here and began changing everything so much. It preserves some of the natural beauty of the wilderness as it is in its most natural and breathtaking. The way, if you will, that it was meant to be.

Topic Question 3:

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Let's keep the Olympics truly wild!

Comments: Dear National Park Service,

I am writing in regard to your drafting of a new management plan for the 876,400 acres of wilderness in the Olympic National Park. I wholeheartedly support the approach described in Alternative B.

Human beings have already left such a huge foot print on our world, that I think every opportunity we have to preserve the beauty and wonders of the natural world, and leave it unaffected by humans, is an opportunity we should take.

The worst approach, by far, would be alternative D, which would only defeat the purpose of having designated wilderness areas in the first place. It would be nice for the wildlife to have places where they can live (or at least go) where there is NO human presence what-so-ever.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Joseph Collins

Correspondence ID:	478	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: yes				

Topic Question 2:
they provide a range of options

Topic Question 3:
no

Comments: I support alternative B for Olympic National Park and wilderness areas management plan

Correspondence ID:	479	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 480 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 481 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 482 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The management approach described in Alternative B seems to be the best

Correspondence ID: 483 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 484 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 11:14:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
To best support the Wilderness Act, Alternative B should be enforced.

Topic Question 2:

Nothing - too much interference by people and our "plans" which always end up destroying instead of protecting our sacred wilderness - what's left of it.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is reasonable and protective of wilderness and National Parks.
The less interference and tampering by humans, the longer it will stay wilderness.

Comments: No motorized equipment or transport (including cars, helicopters, etc.) except for emergencies.

No new structures or developments and leave cultural resources undisturbed.

Confine nature trails to front country only.

Do I have to say it - NO DRILLING, FRACKING COAL, ETC. THE KOCH BROS. CAN MAKE MORE
BILLIONS ELSEWHERE.

Correspondence ID: 485 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
I strongly favor Alternative B. Alternative C. is less acceptable. D. is unacceptable.

Topic Question 3:
lessen human impact

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 486 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please see Comments section below

Topic Question 2:
Please see Comments section below

Topic Question 3:
Please see Comments section below

Comments: 1. I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 487 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I feel the only real viable option is B but the range is OK

Topic Question 2:

Preservation of Wilderness as it should be . No impact on the land is the ideal. Let nature rule!

Topic Question 3:

If you choose B then I feel you have done your job.

Comments: Limit the impact of Man. Keep wilderness wild.

Correspondence ID: 488 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I especially like Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 489 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Western River Guides Association Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
For the most part, they seem to lie within the guidelines of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:
Limit development in wilderness, use NO mechanical means in wilderness, disturb no cultural resources.

Comments: Alternative B appears to me.

Correspondence ID: 490 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, Alternative B seems adequate, with a few provisions added.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B seems to keep the true idea of Wilderness in the forefront.

Topic Question 3:
1. No motorized vehicles except in the case of emergencies.
2. No nature trails in backcountry.
3. Allow nature to take her course in the wilderness, don't allow restoration except small, site-specific areas.
4. No new structure or buildings.
5. No disturbance of cultural resources, including preservation from natural processes.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 491 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The suggested alternatives are sufficient to determine future use of the Wilderness. I believe that the only appropriate alternative is Option B which limits use of the Wilderness to exactly that - continued Wilderness designation.

Topic Question 2:
They provide everyone with a choice for future use of the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:
I believe that the name of the area as Wilderness should tell us how the area should be used = as a Wilderness.

Comments: There is precious little true Wilderness left in the lower 48 states of the United States. We must protect that small amount of Wilderness for future generations of Americans. I live in a huge city and can appreciate the need for wilderness areas as I seldom get to visit them. It is always with the greatest joy when I can truly go to a wilderness area and experience the beauty and quiet and magnificence of what was once the whole of North America. That experience will stay with me forever and I do not want my children and grandchildren to be denied the same experience. There are enough cabins and motels and paved trails and roads and visitor centers and tourist attractions in the country to take care of the needs of those who crave such attractions. LEAVE WILDERNESS

ALONE! PLEASE!

Correspondence ID: 492 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 493 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Society Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternative 2 adheres most closely to the letter and spirit of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:
Less intrusive human presence in all of them.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 494 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B

Topic Question 2:
That they prohibit destruction.

Topic Question 3:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Please protect our amazing wild places. They are the few we have left.

Correspondence ID: 495 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Illumine, LLC Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: OfficialRep

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 496 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Two too many

Topic Question 2:

No action

Reducing physical imprint

Topic Question 3:

As above

Comments:

While many areas of our country are being subjected to environmental degradation, the Park Services are the most important protectors of wilderness. Their mission should be maintained, not diminished by 'alternatives'.

Once the wilderness is gone, it is gone.

Continue to reinforce/support the original mission of the Park services.

Correspondence ID: 497 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please see my comments below in the "comments" box.

Topic Question 2:

Please see my comments below in the "comments" box.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. These are outlined below in the "comments" box.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 498 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep this a wilderness area as much as you can. Don't allow mining!

Correspondence ID: 499 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

For now, yes. Alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, but Alternative B is the best option.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	500	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Solar Wind Works Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	501	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

please see my comments

Topic Question 2:

please see my comments

Topic Question 3:

please see my comments

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	502	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes.					

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B

Comments: I am asking the National Park Service to adopt Alternative B as the management plan for Olympic National Park as it is the one that best preserves wilderness values.

Correspondence ID:	503	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

Provides a good assortment of ideas

Topic Question 3:

To keep wilderness as the key component

Comments: I am in favor of alternative B because it keeps wilderness as the main objective which is only common sense since it is a designated wilderness area and I would very much like to see it remain as such

Correspondence ID:	504	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
I only like alternative number 2

Topic Question 3:
Not in alternative 2

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 505 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
I like the alternative that further limits human interaction with the wilderness area.

Topic Question 3:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 506 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 507 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
It's acceptable. Alternative B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 508 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 509 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B - it does what is needed to maintain and enhance what is truly meant by "wilderness".

Topic Question 3:
See notes below

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	510	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes.				

Topic Question 2:
I would like to indicate my support for the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: I have fond memories of 2 wilderness trips I made in the Olympics years ago. These wild places are so special. Please keep them wild for the generations to come. Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	511	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

See my comments in the comment box below.

Topic Question 2:

See my comments in the comment box below.

Topic Question 3:

See my comments in the comment box below.

Comments: I am writing in support of the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	512	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B, with additions, is a reasonable choice

Topic Question 3:

I would:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	513	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 12:17:30				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

I do not feel there is a sufficient range of alternatives and as such would hope that until additional alternates are proposed Alternate A be enacted.

Topic Question 2:

I appreciate and value the focus on wilderness protection as well as the consideration for reduction of human impact.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, several - abandonment of trails, quota/use limits, waste management and permits. Please refer to comments below.

Comments: I have issue with the abandonment of numerous trails and believe for these identified trails volunteer groups should be allowed to maintain in a similar fashion as to that which is currently in place.

Quota/use limits should be considered and perhaps implemented for overnight use at specific high-use areas (in addition to what is already in place). However, quota/use limits for day use is unreasonable and I struggle to think of areas in which this action is necessary or warranted.

Requiring bear canisters for food storage throughout the park (Alternatives B-D) is not necessarily a poor idea, but requiring human waste bags in all areas above 3,500 feet may be (Alternatives B-C).

I recognize there is difficulty in allowance of a self-registration permitting system. I frequently make use of this system when departing early in the morning or late at night. My hope would be in the event of elimination of this system other reasonable options would be in place for obtaining permits when departing at unconventional hours.

I love Olympic National Park and am wholeheartedly behind protection of wilderness. However, Alternatives B-D enact moderate to extreme changes to the ways in which we enjoy and recreate within Olympic National Park. "Reduction of human impact" is a good and sound idea amid the wilderness, but I believe there must be manageable ways in which to accomplish this without alienating or making excessively difficult the access to the very places in which we are trying to protect.

I do not believe Alternatives B-D accomplish this, and until different alternates are proposed my hope is that

Alternate A (No-Action Alternate) will be chosen.

Correspondence ID: 514 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes; I believe the choices are viable.

Topic Question 2:

The options are clearly defined, and logical: Do nothing; add protections; roll back protections, but, repair damage caused thereby; or, allow damage to continue, unabated, and unrepaired. Sound about right?

Topic Question 3:

Yes. My choice in these matters is always the same: Fix what has been damaged, as much as possible, and limit the possibilities for further damage.

Comments: Therefore; I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except in emergencies, and, especially motorized land vehicles, such as Quads/three-wheeled "sport" vehicles. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from the wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains, and, should, therefore, be removed.

c. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage, or, removing unnecessary structures.

e. Confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 515 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, Alternative B is the best solution

Topic Question 2:

Meet more of today's objectives than previously was possible.

Topic Question 3:

No changes

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 516 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Spirit Circle Herbs Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Please support Alternative B as the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 2:

We need to preserve the wild space left in our country as much as possible. This alternative is the best opportunity to do so.

Topic Question 3:

However to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Our wild spaces are the last of a long heritage of open land and an opportunity to connect to nature. As the one of only a few such heritage spaces left, we need to do all in our power to preserve it as naturally as possible. The use of motorized equipment and recreational vehicles, means environmental degradation and causes long-term pollution and environmental damage to fragile eco-systems.

Please support the natural conditions in your provisions to make these spaces accessible to all.

Sincerely,
Margaret Turner, MA

Correspondence ID: 517 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 12:18:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes. I support Alternative B.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience). However to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

The following modifications should be made to Alternative B.

- a. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 518 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Xun Biosphere Project Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Adopt the Plan B

Comments: Protect the Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 519 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
They include alternative B.

Topic Question 3:
Make sure hunting and trapping are banned forever.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 520 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would like to see an alternative that keeps the Olympic wilderness as wild and untrammled by humans as possible. It is essential that we have true wilderness left to give to the succeeding generations. Once it is developed, that quality of wildness that is so nurturing to the spirit is ruined.

Topic Question 2:
I like option B best of all.

Topic Question 3:
Yes. it should include the prohibition of motorized vehicles and equipment. (except for emergencies, such as rescue

helicopters) . it is important for my own wilderness experience not to hear what i hear in the suburbs....loud motors going all the time.

Also it should prohibit the construction of new structures. Rather the provisions should allow natural processes to reign.

I would like to see developed "nature trails" be limited to the front country. keep the interior of the park as wild as possible.

Comments: As we move into this next phase of our cultural history, i believe it will be about restoration of our natural ecosystems. An essential part of this will be recognizing and honoring the parts of our country that have not yet been developed.

The olympic peninsula is very precious, as it is still largely wild.

We should make sure it stays that way- --we need to protect it from ever-encroaching developers, who are always looking to expand their industry.

I have lived in areas of the country where the development was left unchecked, and it is depressing to the human spirit. I am moving to the olympic peninsula this summer just to be near the Park, and the wildness that it has. I have spent alot of time in Yosemite National Park, and I think the valley is ruined with all the development. It is stressful to go there in the summer.

We need to protect the jewel that we have here, for future generations of America. We need to let it stay wild and undeveloped. Hurricane Ridge is developed enough for people who don't travel by foot.

Correspondence ID:	521	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	522	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes, the complete alternative is just to leave it alone for the sake of the beauty of it and for the life of the critters that call it home. On a walk, I was encountered by a rustling of the leaves nearby. When I looked up, there was a black				

bear watching me from the top of a tree. Of course, I ran back on the trail as fast as I could to my car. On the way back, I noticed a snake that was trying to swallow a tiny frog. The snake in turn was frightened by my intrusion and coughed up the frog. Such are the possible adventures while in an untouched natural surrounding. My father, during the denuding of the old growth in the early 20th century was a logger who cut down trees for the buildings that the were needed and for exports business. How many more trails for four-wheel drives, ATVs are needed to entertain us? Please let us respect and conserve the natural beauty and special gifts we have in the Olympics. After all, God made us stewards of this beautiful place.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	523	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Too many, B should be followed & C should be the only other consideration.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	524	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Too many, B should be followed & C should be the only other consideration.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 525 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I wholeheartedly believe in and support Alternative B-

Topic Question 2:

I agree with and support 100% te management approach, meaning, every provision and modification, in Alternative B.

a- Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b- Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c- Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d- Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e- Confine nature trails to the front country; do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

None....

Comments: Time has proven that our remote wilderness areas exist well on their own, without human interference. Only when we humans gain access is there destruction, causes for concern, or need for repair. By leaving Olympic National Park and Wilderness remote and pristine, we will ensure its survival for generations to come. People seem to forget, ignore, or are mindless of the fact that all of nature is alive, as alive as we are. What we do to nature we do ourselves. All we have or own, all we create, comes from nature. We cannot exist without it, yet nature is perfectly able to live without us. We must limit the effects of human waste, pollution and litter, allow nature to tend to what she does best unimpeded whenever there is fire, or storms, or other cataclysmic events. Motorized recreational and nonrecreational vehicles have a long history of thoroughly disrespecting the places they enjoy-not only tearing up the environment, but encroaching on wildlife habitats, stressing wildlife, our streams rivers ponds become polluted.

There must be some places left in the world allowed to exist for its own sake, not merely to provide a select few

snowmobiling or cross country jeep excursions. Let Olympic National Park and Wilderness remain one of those miraculous places.

Correspondence ID: 526 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

However to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: To The National Park Service,

Regarding the draft of the management plan for the 876,400-acre Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park, I write to ask that you please:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B, and include the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you,

Rebecca Hellman

1161 York Ave. Apt. 1M

New York NY 10065

Correspondence ID: 527 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, although I suggest that improvements can be made to the alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

I suggest the following changes:

1. prohibit motorized equipment with exceptions for emergencies. All research activities and other administrative functions should comply with these rules.
2. prohibit new structures, installations and developments.
3. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and subject to natural processes.
4. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit restoration activities to repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. keep nature trails in the frontcountry, not in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	528	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	529	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Mr. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We support PLAN B. Protect our wilderness! PLEASE

Correspondence ID: 530 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
marginal

Topic Question 2:

I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B with the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 531 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Mostly limiting human interference in any form. Protecting wildlife is priority.

Comments: As above:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	532	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Wilderness Society Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes - these alternatives cover a sufficient range.					

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Topic Question 2:

They protect somewhat the Olympic Mountains from human destruction

Topic Question 3:

No significant changes but understand where the human footprint is allowed nature is destroyed

Comments:

The Mountains are fragile. Mankind is exploding and destroying more and more every day. Please protect some of what our quality of life depends on - our air, soil, water, etc.

Correspondence ID: 533 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I am pleased with these alternatives

Topic Question 2:

They are considerate of the environment in most ways

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 534 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, but only one will work.

Topic Question 2:

I like B? That is an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Yes it should state, natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control and the following points.

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Comments: We need to protect the natural areas we have left. Over development and fracking is impeding on previously undisturbed habits and natural areas everyday.

Correspondence ID: 535 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives B and C would be an improvement over existing management policies, but I favor alternative B as the only alternative that has potential to achieve the goals of the Wilderness Act. Alternatives C and D are too intrusive and will impair the park's resources for the enjoyment of future generations.

I support alternative B for the following reasons and with these provisos:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 536 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Sufficient

Topic Question 2:

Only support Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

See comments below

Comments: I urge support of management approach described in Alternative B including five provisions and modifications below:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 537 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I am for alternative b. limiting human footprints on the area which reduce erosion and animal disturbing . I don't think you need to close to all human traffic. but limit what can be disturb. maybe guided tours etc.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 538 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Conservation NW Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

They provide enough options for unforeseen circumstances, such as the C-141 I helped clean up above Home Lake, back in 1975. Stuff happens and aesthetics count.

Topic Question 3:

More emphasis on Wilderness edge trails and trail related facilities, such as the Waterhole Hut, to deflect and absorb impact away from critical habitats, as outlined in my book: Ski Trails and Wilderness.

Comments: This additional response was triggered by an email from Wilderness Watch, a senile NGO who lost their credibility years ago. Check with Dick Martin the retired super at Wrangell and Sequoia, or the Green Mountain Lookout dust up, if you need too verify this. Wilderness Watch is well intentioned but ill-informed about Wilderness management in this modern age of overcrowding.

Correspondence ID: 539 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: KEEP OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK WILD AND FREE FROM DEVELOPMENT!

Correspondence ID: 540 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I believe that the range of alternatives is sufficient.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B preserves the wilderness best.

Topic Question 3:

I would add to Alternative B the following elements:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	541	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

They appear to cover the entire spectrum of possibilities.

Topic Question 3:

I support Alternative B.

As a former NPS employee in Yellowstone and GTNP I am attuned to the idea of wilderness, especially as prescribed in the Wilderness Act. Therefore, I hope that you will ensure that you will include a respect for "wilderness" as that which is not changed by human action but only by natural forces.

This would include provision that prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, including helicopters, except for in emergencies.

Remove - or allow to deteriorate - any existing buildings or trail shelters.

Allow natural processes to operate. We don't need human interference, except to maintain trails into the interior. Your trail crews do awesome work!

People will expect to see "nature trails" with interpretive hikes. My wife was a NPS Ranger-Naturalist for 10 seasons. Please see that they are close to backcountry access points and are not in the backcountry which should maintain a "wilderness experience."

Thank you,

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 542 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 3:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Please prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Please prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Please leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Please allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Please confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 543 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Sufficient, yes. But only B has the proper "Wilderness" management plan.

Topic Question 2:
Nothing that will impact the the Park's "wilderness" designation

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B would be the correct option for moving forward.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	544	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:
I like Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:
Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.
Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness.
Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	545	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
The alternatives appear to cover the subject broadly!					

Yes

Topic Question 2:

They appear to cover the gamut very thoroughly!

Topic Question 3:

No need of changes noticed.

Comments: I agree with the proposal contained in Option B, and would be very comfortable seeing it in force for our stellar and beautiful Olympic Park!

Correspondence ID:	546	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Ms. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

yes

Topic Question 2:

an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; that sounds like the most sound option for the future. we must take steps to balance human impact on our diminishing wildlands and wildlife, option B sounds like the best option

Topic Question 3:

the more we protect the wilderness for the future, the better species diversity we will have, the cleaner the water and air, the better for the future generations.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	547	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

See answer to Question 3 below.

Topic Question 2:

See below.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for natural and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or

campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 548 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Lost Highway Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I hope so.

Topic Question 2:

B is the one that provides the most protection for those who like wilderness. Two stroke motors and helicopters do not make one feel as if they are in the wilderness much less for the actual inhabitants (the animals that live there). I strongly recommend option B.

Comments: Pressures come to bear that are not in the interest of the environment at large. They are hard to resist but resist them we must. The area in question is named Olympic Wilderness. Let's keep it wilderness. We need VISION that looks to decades in the future. Future generations will need wilderness as much if not more than we do. Please have vision that protects the wilderness. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 549 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 550 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I like Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	551	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes with further modifications of these alternatives.					

Topic Question 2:

I Support the management approach described in Alternative B which is the alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

The management approach described in Alternative B with the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	552	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

I like Alternative B management plan. No motorized vehicles in wilderness. Helicopters allowed only in a recognized emergency situation. Not for routine work or maintenance (trails) or surveys. Wilderness should stay untouched and pristine. Trails should be maintained but not highways into the wild. No new buildings or manmade structures should be constructed. If campgrounds exist they should be maintained to keep them from expanding their impact on the environment. Signs and trails should be few in number to maintain the wilderness character but still provide some access to the backcountry.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B. Allow natural processes to proceed on structures. Weathering is OK. We should not travel into a wilderness area expecting newly painted or renovated structures.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 553 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Please support Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Only like Alternative B with my suggestions above.

Topic Question 3:

As noted in my answer to question one - that should do it.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 554 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

It offers a range

Comments: I support Option B, an alternative that limits the human footprint on the park. I favor a plan that would...

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Correspondence ID:	555	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:	
---------------------	--

Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:
------------------------	-------------------

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	556	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
See below					

Topic Question 2:
See below

Topic Question 3:
See below

Comments: PLEASE:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	557	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: see below				

Topic Question 2:
see below

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: Please support the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	558	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: see further question's comments				

Topic Question 2:

both B and C are an improvement

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation, however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, except for in emergencies.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 559 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Catholic Benedictine Community Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We need to be very good stewards of our land and resources.

Take courage to do the right thing for us and our beautiful country. Thank you.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 560 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 561 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B will prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. It will ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

It will prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

It will leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

It will allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

It will confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	562	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Ms. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 563 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: We support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 564 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 565 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 566 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 3:

- 1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 567 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 14:51:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Other park regulations affect Wilderness visitation. This planning process is an opportunity to reconsider at least three them.

1) The annual Superintendent's Compendium signed July 2013 reads, in relevant part, "Overnight use of the following backcountry structures is prohibited except in emergencies"
Low Divide Shelter - this structure collapsed in 1999.
12 Mile Shelter - this structure was buried completely up to its eaves in flood gravel in 2007.
Pelton Creek Shelter in the Queets - one wall of this structure collapsed in 2007, and the entire structure collapsed flat onto the ground in 2009.
Their continued presence on the annual Superintendent's Compendium is a mystery.

The need to ban non-emergency overnight use of other shelters, such as those on the Hoh, is highly questionable. Shelters are utilitarian structures which were built for public use. Olympic NP's General Management Plan states that historic structures will be managed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Preservation of Historic Properties". Its first standard is "A property will be used as it was historically". This recognizes that use is an intrinsic part of its historic value, and continuing use is key to its continued preservation. No justification is given for overriding this standard.

2) The Superintendent's Compendium also reads "The following areas are subject to overnight camping limits during the period May 1 through September 30. Self-registration is not authorized in these areas... Determining factors: These areas receive a great deal of use and permits are required to reduce visitor conflicts and impacts to natural resources."

Lake Constance. This area had high visitation in the 1970s. Visitation declined precipitously due to the Dosewallips Road washout in 2002. The trail was closed for two years following the 2009 forest fire which severely damaged the route. The claim that it receives "a great deal of use" appears long outdated. The continued quotas need to be justified by releasing visitation statistics.

Swimming Bear Lake (aka Cat Lake), Cat Basin, Lake Lillian and Upper Lena Lake are also areas where it is dubious that quotas are justified by excessive use or observable resource impacts. This is due both to changing visitation patterns (they are out of dayhike range) and the widespread adoption of "Leave No Trace" ethics.

3) In 2014, a new restriction was added to the concession agreement required for commercial packing: packers must give the Wilderness Information Center 10 days advance notice to receive a backcountry permit. No written justification is given. The WIC office verbally justifies this "to cover guides who took frequent trips into the backcountry and waited until the last minute to get their permits".

Frankly, given our changable weather, anyone who sets a firm date for a backcountry trip in Olympic NP more than three days in advance is either very optimistic or enjoys camping in the rain.

It is physically impossible for guides who "take frequent trips into the backcountry" have to file a backcountry camping permit when they are on another trip in the backcountry ten days before their next trip. Even if they carry a satellite phone, WIC no longer accepts permit applications by phone. The active season in Olympic is very limited; most visitation occurs in July and August. Visitors often change their itineraries for many reasons. The scarcity of packers and guides is a significant limitation for many visitors.

Finally, what's "wrong" with getting a permit "at the last minute"? The permit system is computerized. If the stock campsite is available, it is no less convenient for WIC to issue the permit for the next night than for one ten days in the future.

The founding purpose of national parks is for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

Regulations which arbitrarily compromise this purpose should only be issued if there is a clear need.

Correspondence ID: 568 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The range is more than enough.

Topic Question 2:

I like that you are THINKING about how the wilderness should be managed. However, only alternative B will sufficiently protect the wilderness. A and C are not effective, and D is positively damaging.

Topic Question 3:

Only option B sufficiently limits human imprint on the wilderness. Also, it is imperative that human intervention does not replace the natural processes of restoration. Only basic items, such as minimal developed trail maintenance, should be done by humans.

Comments: As you continue your planning, I would appreciate if you would choose to:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 569 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Pretty much.

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives B and C would be improvements over current policy, with B better than C. B best meets the goals of The Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 570 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I like alternative B because it protects the maximum wilderness area while allowing for backcountry recreation.

Comments: Please choose alternative plan B.

Correspondence ID: 571 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Protect the wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Save the trees.

Topic Question 3:

Enlarge the area.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 572 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 573 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 574 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The four alternatives are sufficient.

Topic Question 2:

I am glad you are NOT letting serious damage occur. Too many natural areas are being ruined forever so business corporations can make short-term profits. PROTECT WILDERNESS!!!!!!

The best alternative of these four is Alternative B. It can be improved as described below.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the best.

PLEASE IMPROVE Alternative B in these ways:

1: COMPLETELY PROHIBIT the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. MAKE SURE that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

2: PROHIBIT NEW STRUCTURES, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

3: DO NOT DISTURB ANY CULTURAL RESOURCES, SUCH AS NATIVE AMERICAN SITES. Even if natural processes endanger them, LET THE NATURAL PROCESSES PREVAIL without any human intervention.

4: ALLOW ALL NATURAL PROCESSES TO CONTINUE NATURALLY, because Mother Nature knows what she is doing for sustainability. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

5: SHARPLY LIMIT NATURE TRAILS to FRONT-COUNTRY area only. If any interpretive information is needed, limit it to basic information in a modest location. PROTECT THE WILDERNESS.

With these constraints, Alternative B will be great!

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID:	575	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Alternative B is the only option that minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: 1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	576	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Just barely. The alternative that recommends reducing the human footprint in the Wilderness is the best that can be had at this point.

Topic Question 2:

Not much; it's all too commercial.

Topic Question 3:

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Leave cultural resources undisturbed; if they didn't get there naturally, they don't need to be perpetuated. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded - i.o.w., stay the heck out of the way. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry,

Comments: It's called "Wilderness" for a reason. Don't allow any alternatives to "pave Paradise".

Correspondence ID: 577 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes. However, to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 578 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 579 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I feel these alternatives are more than enough.

Topic Question 2:

I do not like A or D at all. B seems to me to be the only acceptable alternative, with C being an unpleasant second choice.

Topic Question 3:

Remove Alternatives A and D.

Comments: This area is one of the most beautiful and pristine natural environments in the US. It should be left as such. The only "recreation" allowed should be the enjoyment of what is there as it is.

Correspondence ID: 580 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 581 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: stay with (B) keep the land sacred what ever you do...

Correspondence ID: 582 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 583 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 584 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 585 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I don't know. It's hard to pull something unseen into what has already been proposed. There's always something more we can do. At least regulate the rate of what we take out with what is able to be replenished. Otherwise, we're gonna lose it! It will be like global warming, we were warned, but didn't take heed. Take this as a warning. Don't wait until it's gone to say, "Yup, they were right".

Topic Question 2:

I would like "us" as a country to preserve as much wilderness as we can. We have to think about the future, not just put cement everywhere and not give a care what happens later. We are so dependent upon nature, really, and so many people don't realize that. We lose our ice, lose our forests, lose our wildlife, we're pretty much SOL. We need to care for the earth as if it was our baby, because it is.

Topic Question 3:

If anything, I would err on the side of nature and its rhythms.

Comments: I never thought these would be issues in my lifetime. It is so sad. I think the world would be a happier place had mankind never existed.

Correspondence ID: 586 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am asking you to support Alternative B including prohibiting all motorized use, (excepting emergencies); non-essential development, structures and other improvements which might detract from the wilderness character. As to the other suggestions from Wilderness Watch, I would defer to others more familiar with those issues. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 587 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see a plan to reduce the physical human imprint in the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 588 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

Option B, as it minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience)

Topic Question 3:

Yes, to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Hi

I'm writing in support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 589 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As far as I can judge the range of alternatives is sufficient. However even in Alternative B I could not identify Zone 6 on the maps - is the wilderness which is not marked as trails zoned 1-5 considered Zone 6?

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B: Limitation of use of motor vehicles and motorized equipment, reduction of human imprint.

Alternative C: removal of non-native species, reintroduction of extirpated species, restoration of natural fire regimes, and natural channel migration

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities

and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the modifications mentioned in question 3: Motorized equipment should be prohibited, as well as new structures and developments. In addition, where appropriate, it should be considered to include ecosystem restoration and management actions as supported in Alternative C.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID:	590	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

I like alternatives B and C the best. Doing nothing is not an alternative.

Topic Question 3:

Minimize the use of motorized equipment and transport. Minimize the construction of new structures but allow new nature/interpretive trails.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	591	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Wilderness Society Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
This is a sufficient range of alternatives.					

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

a. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. Confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 592 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 593 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, it's comprehensive.

Topic Question 2:

The only one I like is B, "an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness". Once you open the door even a crack in terms of letting in more people and vehicles, certain elements will agitate for it to get wider and wider.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I fully support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

The more this land can be preserved and managed to be the way it was, the better. Thank you for considering my suggestions and opinion.

Correspondence ID:	594	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				
	a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.				
	b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.				
	c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.				
	d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.				
	e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.				

Correspondence ID:	595	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Mr. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				
	a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.				
	b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness.				

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 596 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, but Alt. B is best.

Topic Question 2:
See below.

Topic Question 3:
See below.

Comments: Regarding Olympic National Park, alternatives B) reducing the physical human imprint in the Wilderness, is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 597 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: [Member, Sierra Club] Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The four alternatives offered seem to exhaust the feasible possibilities

Topic Question 2:
They represent courses of action that are do-able and economically practicable.

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B for management of the Olympic NF seems the most benign of the four.

Comments: Plan B for management of the Olympic NF should be modified to minimise management impact by 1)restricting 'interpretive trails' exclusively to entrance areas; 2)removing unnecessary service buildings and forbidding new construction save for trail maintenance; 3)Restrict vehicular access and roads to an absolute minimum; 4) forbid off-road vehicles of all kinds at all times of the year; 5)generally allowing the natural evolution of local forest with minimal intervention (no timber-harvest masquerading as tree culling, save to prevent active invasion by threatening pest species.

By letting it alone, the Forest Service can best discharge its obligation to make this magnificent wilderness area available to be appreciated by generations of a grateful public.

Respectfully,

A. Jack Garnett

Correspondence ID: 598 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service Decision Makers,

We write today to urge your support of the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

We believe that the above actions will ensure the reduction of the human imprint in the Olympic Wilderness!

Thank you for your time and consideration of our request!

Kind regards,

Dave and Rita Cross

Correspondence ID: 599 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Plan B is the best one.

Topic Question 2:
Plan B is the best one.

Topic Question 3:
Plan B is the best one.

Comments: Plan B is the best one.

Correspondence ID: 600 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Please leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail. And allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Topic Question 2:

N/A

Topic Question 3:

Please prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Correspondence ID:	601	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	602	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am answering below with the guidelines I feel are appropriate to the preservation of the Olympic Park. B seems like the only guideline that works.

Topic Question 2:

B limits the human impact on an amazing resource.

Comments: 1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	603	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Yakima Psychological Services Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	604	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Topic Question 2:

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Topic Question 3:

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	605	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Primarily				

Topic Question 2:

As a frequent visitor to Olympic National Park, I urge you to select Alternative B in the proposed management plan because it best supports the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

I strongly urge you to improve on Alternative B in the following ways:

1. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, except in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.
3. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, even when threatened by natural processes.
4. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. Confine nature trails to the front country, and do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Everywhere across the west I see increasing intrusion on wild areas. Please do everything necessary to maintain the highest possible wilderness value in the Park.

Comments: Everywhere across the West, I see increasing intrusion on wild areas. Please do everything necessary to maintain the highest possible wilderness value in the Park.

Correspondence ID:	606	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

The range is somewhat sufficient but option B is the best one to preserve the wilderness experience long term for the Olympic peninsula.

Topic Question 2:

I like the aspect that preserves the area for future generations. Alternative B addresses the following aspects of wilderness preservation by:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

It has been a while since I visited ONP.. I feel the ONP is a great place itself - but as yo drive to access it there are a number of clear cut areas that hopefully have regenerated soomewhat by now. Seeing that devastation on the way to the wildernes is a real bummer.

We need to keep the area as pristine as possible for future generations - that is why it is designated wilderness

Comments: thanks for keeping it wild for our children and grandchildren's sake!

Correspondence ID:	607	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

This is sufficient, provided that the modifications I mention below are implemented.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 608 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Peace and Freedom Party Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Let's keep the Olympics wild!

Topic Question 2:
Let's keep the Olympics wild!

Topic Question 3:
Let's keep the Olympics wild!
Hire MANY MANY people to tend to our land. These are labor intensive opportunities - that is, opportunities for people to work in a job that feels good to do. As I advocate for farming - end the 24/7 job. End the 8 hour a day requirement for jobs. Work has to be a pleasant experience, serving our human tendencies, not our Owners' control of our lives.

Comments: Lets keep the Olympics wild!
The National Park Service is drafting a management plan for the 876,400-acre Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park (95% o the park is designated Wilderness).

The planning process is at the critical stage where the agency determines the various alternatives that will appear in the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). If the alternatives dont adequately address or include the key issues facing the Wilderness, then neither will the final plan.

The Park Service has identified four alternatives: A) no action; B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation opportunities.

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 609 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,14,2014 16:47:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
See our comments pasted below.

Topic Question 2:
See our comments pasted below.

Topic Question 3:
See our comments pasted below.

Comments: May 14, 2014

Sarah Creachbaum, Superintendent ATTN: Wilderness Stewardship Plan Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362
Sent via US Mail and the Internet

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:

Wilderness Watch is providing these comments on the preliminary alternatives for the Wilderness Stewardship Plan. Wilderness Watch is a national nonprofit wilderness conservation organization dedicated to the protection and proper stewardship of the National Wilderness Preservation System. The extraordinary Olympic Wilderness is one of the preeminent Wildernesses in the entire wilderness system. You have a unique opportunity to set in motion the long-term preservation of this incredible Wilderness in this planning effort.

Introduction

The plan seems to be moving in a positive direction regarding protection of wilderness character. For example, the apparent decision to not include so-called historic structures as contributing to wilderness character in the action alternatives is a positive step. (NOTE: We address concerns with breaking down wilderness character into four or five elements later in this comment). Other positive elements include the recognition of the importance of trailless areas, the recognition that any commercial services need to be necessary and proper, and that at least in some alternatives natural processes would prevail over human artifice and structures.

However, there is no alternative that emphasizes the key element of wilderness character, untrammeled wilderness. Thus, we suggest changes to Alternative B or a new alternative be considered. None of the alternatives (B, C, or D) address this issue fully, though alternative B comes closest, and is generally the best option of those presented by the Park Service. In the next sections we provide suggestions for Alternative B or a new alternative and how that direction would differ from the draft alternatives presented in the scoping letter.

Wilderness Background

It appears all of the alternatives are based on the assumption that the Wilderness Act suffers from an irreconcilable, internal inconsistency between the mandate to preserve an "untrammeled" Wilderness while also administering the area and to preserve its "natural conditions." This is often referred to as the conflict between "wildness" and "naturalness." Yet no such conflict exists in the Wilderness Act.

Writing in the Denver University Law Review attorney Michael McCloskey, former chairman of the Sierra Club and one of the organization's leaders who worked to pass the Wilderness bill, addressed this supposed conflict:

Any meaning given to the phrase "natural conditions" should be consistent with the key idea of not "trammeling" these areas. This interpretation is favored because this language comes first and, in accordance with rule of statutory construction, it avoids any unnecessary implication of conflict between the provisions. Changing Views of What the Wilderness System is all About, Denver University Law Review. Vol. 76, No. 2.

The "natural conditions" the Wilderness Act sought to preserve are those that result from administering an untrammeled Wilderness. As one of the earliest, leading wilderness researchers Bob Lucas described, "If ecological processes operate essentially uncontrolled within the Wilderness frame of reference, the results, whatever they might be, are desirable by definition. The object is to let nature 'roll the dice' and accept what results with interest and scientific curiosity."

The historical record is replete with evidence that "untrammeled" is the preeminent quality of Wilderness, or at least it was for the framers of the Act and those who worked to pass the Wilderness law. As Wilderness Act author Howard Zahniser explained to Congress in 1963, the first sentence of the definition of wilderness, which describes wilderness as untrammeled, "is definitive of the meaning of the concept of wilderness, its essence, its essential nature." More recently, a report commissioned by the four federal land management agencies through the Pinchot Institute for Conservation recommended, "Since wild is a fundamental characteristic of wilderness that is not attainable elsewhere, if there is a choice between emphasizing naturalness and wildness, stewards should err on the side of wildness." Thus it is incumbent on NPS to emphasize the preservation of untrammeled Wilderness in at least one alternative, if not all. Further, if management is going to seek to preserve "naturalness" it seems necessary to

define what is meant by the term. For example, what time period/vegetation condition/faunal assemblages would managers seek to recreate and maintain? Does trying to replicate any previous condition make sense given we're entering an era for which there is no analog?

Alternatives

As noted above, none of the alternatives seem to fully address wild or untrammeled Wilderness. We suggest the following elements become part of Alternative B or part of a new alternative that emphasizes untrammeled Wilderness:

• Do not set up untrammeled and natural as opposites. The same holds true for untrammeled and undeveloped and the other qualities of wilderness character. View wilderness character as a whole, with the emphasis on wildness.

• Emphasize natural processes in recovery of populations of native species. Natural recolonization would be preferred over overt introductions. None of the alternatives is very explicit on this point.

• Ecological manipulation would not occur. Only rare and noncontroversial protection efforts that don't manipulate the ecosystem such as pulling weeds at a campsite would be allowed. None of the alternatives is very explicit on this point.

• Recognize that cultural resources almost always distract from wilderness character because these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management. As in alternatives B and C, where cultural resources are threatened by natural processes, natural processes would prevail under this alternative. However, unlike alternatives B and C, maintenance in perpetuity of non-essential structures would not occur as this, in fact, amounts to a long-term reconstruction.

• Scientific research is carried on in a manner compatible with Wilderness. For example, scientists should no more be allowed to use motorized transport or equipment than recreationists in wilderness. This is similar to alternative B.

• The trail system, any infrastructure (trail signs, bridges) would be the minimum necessary for preservation of the area as wilderness. This would result in a decrease in the number of structures in the Wilderness. This is similar to B except education about appropriate backcountry human waste techniques, rather than toilets, would be provided. Quotas are preferable to structures.

• Visitor use would be administered to provide for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation in such a way as to maintain the wildness of the area in perpetuity. This may mean quotas for day use in the Wilderness. More details on visitor use are explained in the following paragraphs.

In terms of visitors and recreation use, the draft alternatives seem to make a similar error with regard to primitive and unconfined recreation and solitude as is made regarding untrammeled and natural. According to the scoping information, Alternative B provides for better primitive recreation while Alternative C provides for more solitude. While the information is short on details, we don't see why these values are necessarily exclusive. An untrammeled alternative would provide both.

In terms of stock use, Alternative C provides fewer trails, supposedly based upon the ability to maintain trails. Alternative B should have a similar prescription since it is also supposed to minimize the human imprint and be based upon the ability to maintain trails. A low human impact alternative like B or an untrammeled alternative should only allow stock use to a level that maintains the wilderness character of the area in perpetuity. That would most likely be what Alternative C proposes, though there is little information presented in the Park Service information for this issue. What are the stock numbers (8 head currently) for the various alternatives?

Under none of the alternatives are quotas explained in any detail. How would these differ by alternatives? Are the group sizes (6 in some zones in Alternatives B and C and 12 everywhere in Alternative D) adequate to protect the Wilderness?

Regarding party size for stock, might it be better to allocate group size based upon heartbeats or possibly biophysical impacts? Pack and riding stock tend to have a much greater impact on trails, around campsites, and in most other areas than do humans. Currently, stock users can take 12 people and 8 head of stock, which is a far greater impact than simply 12 people on foot.

Under any alternative, would camping be allowed outside of designated sites? The scoping materials are not clear on this point. It would be preferable to adjust quotas rather than maintain an infrastructure that goes along with assigned campsites.

The differences between campfire restrictions under various alternatives are not explained. Would adjustments in quotas and requiring techniques that minimize damage (dig a temporary pit, fire blankets, and no fire rings) be important to reduce impacts under any alternative?

The differences between alternatives regarding commercial services are not clear. Alternative B would only provide for commercial services for the mobility impaired. Alternative C would have no increased effects on natural resources. Alternative D would only allow commercial services to the extent necessary. How are those different? If

they are different, how do they all meet the Wilderness Act?

Furthermore, the Park Service proposes to allow photography workshops under the rubric of commercial services. How is a photography workshop a wilderness dependent activity and how does it meet the requirements of the Wilderness Act regarding commercial services? Would limits on group size apply to this activity?

Similarly, there are proposals for ranger-led outings in Wilderness under the various alternatives. Wouldn't this be considered as front country activity rather than a Wilderness activity?

The materials are not very clear on whether/how existing administrative facilities would be removed if they aren't the minimum necessary? The Park Service admits that many buildings are not needed and that changes in technology may make radio repeaters unneeded.

Under any alternative, including a potential untrammelled alternative, there should be changes to the zoning concept. Looking at the Wilderness as a whole and the infrastructure as a whole might eliminate some or all zoning categories and/or change them so that Nature Trails are confined to the front country. In any case, Zone 1 seems to be inappropriate for Wilderness because it is so reliant on structures and modification. Similarly, the agency needs to recognize that zoning can lead to a defacto dedesignation of areas in the minds of some wilderness administrators.

Summary

The Olympic Wilderness should be one of the wildest in the lower 48 states. The rugged nature of much of the wilderness makes cross-country travel a challenging experience, requiring stamina and in some instances skills in traversing snow and ice fields. The Park Service has a unique opportunity here to produce a plan that fulfills the letter, spirit, and intent of the Wilderness Act by allowing the Wilderness to be wild.

While Alternative B, of the alternatives suggested by the NPS, seems to best meet the letter and spirit of the Wilderness Act, a few elements of Alternative C seem to do a better job in this respect. Changes to Alternative B as suggested in this comment letter or an alternative that emphasizes untrammelled wildness would be best for the Wilderness of Olympic National Park.

Sincerely,

Gary Macfarlane
Board Member

Correspondence ID:	610	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No, as none of the alternatives stress the wilderness character and that, to fully implement both the spirit and the letter of the Wilderness Act, natural processes should be allowed to occur unimpeded. All of the alternatives should require a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

At least two of them (B&C) are improvements over current policy. I support Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, I feel that Alternative B would be strengthened by adding additional elements. The policy should explicitly state that natural processes govern above all else. Where cultural resources or current buildings are threatened by natural processes, those processes should be allowed to proceed. The policy should also make clear that no new structures are allowed. The policy should clearly state that motorized equipment and transport is prohibited except in true emergencies (where human life is in immediate danger, not danger in months). Research and other administrative functions should adhere to this rule. Also, trails should be limited, and there should be no highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	611	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
I would like to see the "do nothing" stay in place.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 612 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
it's okay.

Topic Question 2:
see comments below

Topic Question 3:
see comments below

Comments: I would support the management approach described in Alternative B while including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 613 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS Representative,

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of

Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 614 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

My personal concern is for wilderness and wildlife, and alternatives that not only preserve their well-being, but enhance it. We've done enough damage to our natural world. Let's try to start making it better for the animals, plants and Earth.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 615 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 616 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** May,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Remember, comments are due by May 17 (Saturday) and should

Correspondence ID: 617 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 618 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I support Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

1. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
2. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
3. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
4. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 619 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 620 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No.

The Olympic National Wilderness area requires protection from poachers of natural resources and wildlife.

Topic Question 2:

I have worked in Forestry on the Peninsula, and I have seen the damage and pillage of poachers.

This cannot be allowed to occur in that very special and unique environment.

Jobs for Rangers that can do compliance are required.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 621 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 622 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, Alternative B is sufficient

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B reduces human impact.

Topic Question 3:
Please refer to listed details in comments.

Comments: Support Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 623 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 624 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Peace Montessori School Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,14,2014 19:57:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, I think Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Topic Question 3:

to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 625 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B (see Question 3 answer).

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

For example, use the following:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	626	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

Alt. B prohibits the use of motorized equipment, and would not allow buildings

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 627 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 20:35:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Statement AGAINST Proposed Wilderness Plans: Olympic National Park

The original Congressional language signed by Franklin Roosevelt in 1938 discussed the park's purpose as "to PRESERVE FOR THE BENEFIT , USE AND ENJOYMENT OF THE PEOPLE, the finest samples of primeval forests...; to conserve and render AVAILABLE TO THE PEOPLE, FOR RECREATIONAL USE, this outstanding mountainous countryâ€ I do NOT believe that the proposals contained in the draft Wilderness Stewardship Plan are in concert with this stated purpose for the park. Every one of the proposed alternatives discourages, in one form or another, human access to the park. I firmly believe that we should take steps to improve infrastructure and encourage access to the park by making entry less complicated and more enjoyable. Only by attracting people into the park and providing favorable experiences will it be possible to sustain interest for the funding and support required to preserve this area for future generations.

The original Wilderness Act established by Congress in 1964 talked about an area "untrammelled by man, where man is a visitor who does not remainâ€an area of undeveloped federal landâ€without permanent improvements or human habitation." Key points in the definition are that it "generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable," and that it "has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive type of recreation." In my view, Olympic National Park has already fully met this original definition. No further restrictions are necessary to satisfy the intent of the act. In contrast, the National Park Service published a draft Wilderness Stewardship Plan Handbook in 2012 that, in 83 pages, describes their view of the best way to create a plan for preserving "wilderness character." In my view, the Park Service has strayed too far beyond the scope of the original Wilderness Act. Instead of the Act's moderate view ("generally" appears, affected "primarily" by, "substantially" unnoticeable), the Park Service has gone to the extreme of emphasizing reduction of human imprint, protection of natural resources, or managing visitor use, without balancing the "benefit, use and enjoyment" of the people. Instead of the balance between human impact and the natural resource, which has already been successfully achieved over many years of actual use, the Park Service has proposed an agenda under which all alternatives have the effect of reducing visitor numbers and which opens the door for "temporary or permanent closures" in the park. These "tools" for protecting resources fall under the euphemism of "visitor use management." Additional restrictive elements of the alternative plans include: less infrastructure (reducing the presence of facilities such as structures and bridges), campfire restrictions, reducing the number of signs, not reconstructing historic structures, allowing forest fires to burn, reducing the number of camping areas and campsites, reduction of total trail mileage, further limiting group sizes, requiring bear canisters everywhere in the park.

A stated purpose of the Wilderness Act is to provide solitude for humans. I was born and raised in Port Angeles, and have enjoyed adventures in the park for nearly 60 years. Whenever I have wanted solitude, I have always been able to find it within a few hours of any established trailhead in the park. Opportunities for seclusion are already abundant for adventurers skilled in back-country travel. What is needed is improved access for the majority of visitors who, without some trail improvements such as bridges, would not be able to experience the more remote sections.

In summary, I can only support the "No-action Alternative" for the Wilderness Stewardship Plan, and I urge others to share your views with the superintendent and others in authority before the deadline for public comment which is May 17, 2014.

Correspondence ID: 628 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,14,2014 20:52:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

See comments in letter below (Alternative E proposes that all stock trails remain open but that levels of maintenance are modified or adjusted.

Topic Question 2:

See comments in letter below - stock use on all current stock trails should be preserved in keeping with local history, and generational use and enjoyment. Consider this to be a justifiable "Other Feature of Value" in the evaluation process.

Topic Question 3:

See comments in letter below (Alternative E proposed)

Comments: 4925 Blue Mountain Road
Port Angeles, WA 98362
May 15, 2014

M. Sara Creachbaum, Superintendent
Attn: WSP Preliminary Draft Alternatives
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362-6798

Subject: Comments on Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan

Of the five qualities NPS will use to evaluate the Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) alternatives, my comments apply to the category "Other Features of Value". This quality defined category is appropriate for consideration of my comments in the preparation of the DRAFT EIS. Please address these comments in the NPS refinement and analysis of various Alternatives.

PREMISE: Pack animal use on ONP trails defines ONPs Historical "Character" and is a "Feature of Value"

The "character" unique to the ONP is embodied in history, namely the decades and generations of local use of horses and pack animals in this extraordinary park. The seminal book, "Going Light with Backpack or Burro"(1951) is an example of early conservationists recognizing the value of properly managed burros and mules to extend the enjoyment of wilderness trail experience to those who would devote expense, time, and care in pursuit of responsible trail recreation. The book was compiled and authored by Sierra Club contributors and published before the 1964 Wilderness Act. The use of livestock to enjoy the wilderness responsibly is a precious privilege I and others would hate to lose. In the face of budget restrictions or misunderstandings about who will maintain trails, Alternative E could be proposed, such that existing livestock access trails are retained, but not all are maintained by NPS. Many stock users have the tools and ability to groom or amend a damaged trail, preserve access thru overgrowth, and actually have a long history of doing this on a volunteer basis (back country horsemen's associations).

Pack animals- whether burros, mules, horses or llamas - evolved from the prohibition on wheeled traffic in the park. They provide expanded opportunities for the handicapped to enjoy backcountry that they would not otherwise have access to. ADA trails are few and sedate. The Park should give consideration to this aspect of providing improved access for the handicapped.

Another inspiring treatise is "High Divide: Minnie Peterson's Olympic Mountain Adventures (The Early Years 1915-1962)". Minnie Peterson's "High Divide" captures a piece of history that would be lost with the restrictions outlined in these WSP proposals. To further restrict public use and enjoyment by limited or prohibiting stock use on trails, that are in part maintained by dedicated volunteers, is not justifiable.

The enjoyment of ONP trails is the reason I live in the shadow of Blue Mountain, between Sequim and Port

Angeles. Hiking in the ONP and National Forest is my sole and primary recreation, and the option of using pack animals is dear to me. Our extended family has enjoyed the ONP backcountry since 1950.

I am an environmental compliance professional with 25 years of experience, a licensed veterinarian, and a wildlife biologist. I feel strongly that use of livestock on trails in the park is a "feature of value" that makes the ONP unique and a privilege worth preserving. There are perhaps other sacrifices users would make to preserve this privilege and unique and special way of enjoying the beauty and solitude of ONP.

When I read about Minnie Peterson, and many other guide/horsepacking historical accounts, I am moved not only by the fact that I can repeat or strive to repeat some of these adventures, but also that we are able to have this opportunity.

ONP trail crews are the backbone of an excellent and enjoyable trail system, their scope of work supports the local economy, and creates jobs. Volunteers, including backcountry horseman's associations and dedicated and responsible riders take trail maintenance seriously. If the NPS is trying to manage budget pressure by trail maintenance reductions, the way forward is not to close trails, but to continue to rely on volunteers for the shortfall. To do that you need more volunteers and you don't promote that by closing trails to stock use and shutting down horseman's access.

In fact, the idea behind a Proposal E would be not to "close" those trails to stock use, but rather recognize their status as potentially "not maintained" for stock use. As previously stated the proposal that should be included is not to limit stock use or close stock trails, but re-label same that NPS can not support as either "not maintained" or "maintained by volunteers".

Liability concerns with stock in the park are no different than they have always been. In my experience, there is more chance for a horse to help with transporting an injured individual than a helicopter given terrain, visibility, and alpine fog. Having pack animals as an adjunct to rescue operations is a positive that people often don't consider.

I am passionate about the preserving the beauty and accessibility of the ONP for the remainder of my lifetime and for future generations. If an inspiration or persuasive argument is needed, just read excerpts of the "High Divide". Horsemen, backpackers, conservationists, and all that enjoy the ONP will have their sense of adventure renewed and their connection with nature re-invigorated.

I hope that the NPS can accommodate all the current stock trails remainin open to that use, and instead of restrictions, recognize the variable being the level of maintenance and who conducts the maintenance. There are those that have, and will continue to, responsibly use and maintain trails to the best of their ability - for the enjoyment of so many that would otherwise never experience a backcountry pack trip like nowhere else in the world.

Kate Montgomery, DVM

Correspondence ID:	629	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Dear National Park Service:				

I am a member of Wilderness Watch and believe wilderness areas within national parks should be managed as primitive. The Jewels of the NPS Wilderness must be protected in a way that unimpedes any human progress or comfort. The only management plan that meets the letter and purpose of the wilderness of the Wilderness Act is Alternative B with modifications. Too many times land managers believe wilderness is a place you can travel to a cabin and get out the elements and start a fire and be in comfort, etc., but wilderness should not be interpreted this way by land managers. Wilderness is met on its own terms unimpeded by human intervention or technology. This was the intent of Howard Zahniser who believed that the wilderness experience should emphasize natural processes

and that restorative activities would be conducted by natural processes. We meet the wilderness on its own terms and this includes workers within the park system. I support the management approach described in Alternative "B" which should also include the following points:

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and air transport (except for medical emergencies), this also applies to research activities within the park.

Prohibit new structures and development, Trail shelters and cabins detract from wilderness character. They are relics of the past.

Natural processes should prevail and be allowed to continue unimpeded. Human engineering projects should not involve restoring trail shelters or cabins. The only restorative practices should be repairing campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature or interpretive trails to the Front Country for the normal tourist. Back Country travel should be primitive and undeveloped. Wilderness to me means meeting nature under its own terms with nothing but what is on your back.

I wish to be put on the list for future mailings.

Correspondence ID:	630	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Not enough wilderness as wilderness.				

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in medical emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations, and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains. These should be dismantled and not repaired.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary or unusable structures. No vehicles, ground or air, should be used in these repairs.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	631	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes.

Topic Question 2:

B is an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	632	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	633	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please join me and to support the following:				

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

thank you for your consideration~

most sincerely,

Melissa McCool

Correspondence ID:	634	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 22:36:22				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No! The park system needs to diverse in its use, not narrowed to one user group. We have a many recreation oportunities in ONP from snow skiing to beach combing. The park should expand user groups access to as many areas as possible, not limit use. Look at what has been lost, skiing at deer park, waterhole lost, snowmobile use eliminated etc etc.

Topic Question 2:

Nothing.

Topic Question 3:

Blue bag over 3500 feet? NO!

Comments: What is wilderness? If you watch any TV lately you will notice that the word wilderness is used by people describing there use of four wheeling, pickup camping, etc as wilderness. The average American citizen cannot define what the definition of wilderness is in the context of national park use. Gov Jay Inslee stated that outdoor recreation needs to be encouraged for our young people. The park service needs to expand opportunities for recreation in all catagories to including finishing trails that were never completed and backcountry shelter replacement.

Historical structures such as EVC needs to be preserved in its setting as long as possible. We know that this is what people want as evidenced by the traffic on NW hikers hits at over 22 thousand in four months on this topic.

Back in the late sixties the road to hurricane was open all winter when possible. When road was closed we road up on snowmobiles during the week and it was fantastic. The ride out to obstruction point was especially memorable, and was a big deal for the machines we had at the time.

There is plenty of room in the park for all user groups to enjoy and that is it's purpose as a park to provide for all the peoples tastes in there definition of what wilderness means to them.

Correspondence ID:	635	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This is a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

I support alternative B, which reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	636	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	North Olympic Group of WA State Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,14,2014 22:43:05				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes as a preliminary step, see below					

Topic Question 2:

Please See Text below under comments

Topic Question 3:

Please see Text below under comments.

Comments: May 14, 2014

From: North Olympic Group of WA State Chapter of Sierra Club

Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

RE: Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan, Preliminary Draft Alternatives

The North Olympic Group (NOG) of the Washington State Cascade Chapter of Sierra Club has in its nine hundred members a collection of Olympic Peninsula residents that highly regard the phenomenal tenets of the Wilderness Act of 1964. This group of active wilderness supporters appreciates the opportunity to weigh in on the alternatives presented in the preliminary Draft Wilderness Stewardship Plan and add their voice in favor of permanent, precedent-setting protections for these areas. Each National Park Superintendent has discretionary authority to interpret the Wilderness Act for their parks. We wish to make it clear that the Act's tenets must be upheld and we wish to see an excellent example provided here on the Peninsula. The Wilderness Act provides for "An area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." We need to encourage the maintenance of ecosystem function, beauty, and the transience of our human impact. These goals will require rigorous enforcement of the Wilderness Act's aims.

The North Olympic Group commends the work of this Preliminary Draft Wilderness Stewardship plan, and the effort put into addressing myriad challenges. NOG is very impressed with plans 'Common To All Alternatives'. To have as baseline the careful assessment of visitor use and carrying capacity, the maintenance of trail-less wilderness, no new trails, and the intelligent soft tread of repair, native species support, and absence of inappropriate

commercial use is encouraging and wise.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE(S)

Of the four alternatives presented, the North Olympic Group believes that Alternative B and C best maintain and support the character and intent of the Wilderness Act. Alternative D has little to recommend it when applied to either the goals of the Act or the reality of these highly utilized wilderness areas currently established in the very popular Olympic National Park. Alternative D is a misaligned response to the potential of Wilderness protection for the Park. The only features in Alternative D we could support would be increased ranger-led walks and tribal access to ethnographic resources.

Sierra Club's North Olympic Group gives principal support to Alternative B, which seeks to reduce human impact and provide an experience of wilderness for self-reliant travelers. It provides for the "untrammelled by man" environment that is the most unique and visionary part of the Wilderness Act. Alternative C has excellent provisions for the upkeep of natural systems, resources and native species, which should ALSO be included in any future plan. Restrictions on visitor usage, necessary closures and sensitivity to natural systems as outlined in Alternative B (and the CTAA) should preclude the need for such manmade features as boardwalks or bridges, even in service to restoration/protection endeavors. The wilderness should remain as natural as possible.

ZONE DETAILS

In regards to the proposed excellent organization of draft Zones, we reproduce here and support the suggestions made by Olympic Park Associates on trail designations:

We support the following allocations from Alternative B:

Shi Shi Beach should be zoned 3, secondary, rather than 2, all-purpose (as in C). This area has experienced serious overuse; the current access trail descends a steep bluff (similar to overland trails on the south coast, which are zoned 3). We believe the old overgrown military road should not be re-opened for trail access, nor should zone 1 or 2-level trail structures be incorporated into the approach trail for Shi Shi. This is arguably the most scenic of ONP's wilderness beaches and one of the easiest of access. Quotas for overnight use should be set and secondary foot trail access maintained.

The North Fork Sol Duc should be zoned 4 and 5, primitive and way trail. This reflects current use level and difficulty of access (a river ford difficult to cross early in season). Visitors desiring more developed wilderness trail access have multiple options just up the Sol Duc Road.

The South Fork Hoh trail should be zone 4, primitive, to preserve one west-side rain forest valley available for a more intimate trail experience free of stock use, developed trail structures and developed campsites

Similarly, the Rugged Ridge trail should be classed as zone 4, primitive, to reflect current use and comply with nearby Hoh-Bogachiel trail zoning.

Aurora Ridge should be zoned 4 and 5 for similar reasons.

In addition to the above allocations of Alternative B, we also support zone 4 prescriptions in Alternative C, with fewer maintained trails, and zone 5 in C, with no maintained trails. As pressures on back country areas increase, places such as the Skyline trail from 3 Lakes to Low Divide and Martin's Park trail should be zone 4, primitive, and the Bailey Range, Dodger Point high route, Lillian Ridge, upper Royal Basin, Lake Constance, and Lake of the Angels should certainly be placed in zone 5. Boot-worn way trails should suffice.

We also support specific trail zone elements from other alternatives that would increase resource protection yet allow for a modest increase of compatible use on some trails.

CONCLUSION

This is an exciting opportunity for Olympic National Park to protect its very popular and treasured Wilderness holdings in the most rigorous manner possible and thus provide for their survival for generations to come. The

members of North Olympic Group of Sierra Club thank you for this opportunity to review your excellent preliminary work and express their hopes and keen care for the proper management of our commonly treasured wilderness areas.

Sincerely,

Monica Fletcher, Chair
North Olympic Group, WA State Chapter Sierra Club
P.O. Box 1083
Port Townsend, WA 98368

Correspondence ID:	637	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	638	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	639	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The best alternative is number 2 - to do LESS - there just SHOULD be some places on this planet where there are NO PEOPLE and NO HUMAN ACTIVITY. SOME WILD AND BEAUTIFUL PLACES OUGHT TO BE LEFT WILD AND BEAUTIFUL....

Correspondence ID: 640 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
Plan B.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 641 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, but some alternatives are better than others

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B

It is the most sustainable. Please see proposed changes below

Topic Question 3:

Here are the suggested changes:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 642 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

I like to support the management approach in Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

I would like to see the following modifications:

- a. prohibit motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 643 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I think Alt. B doesn't go far enough to limit human intervention. Besides allowing a few near to roads trails for hiking purposes, after that, that's it. Nothing but the Olympic National Forest. Those hiking trails need to be limited to 1 - 10 miles and then they end. No managed forest. Let nature manage.

Topic Question 3:

I feel that there's still no totally wilderness Alternative. It's a forest. Let

it be a wilderness forest. I do not want a managed forest in a way, shape or form. Alt. B is as close as I'm allowed to see the Olympic Forest. There should always be a Wilderness Alternative. No mechanization, no infrastructure, no designated campsites, no thru forest roads, no trails, etc.

Comments: See answers to Q. 1 & 3

Correspondence ID: 644 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.
- Jean Marie Naples, MD-Ph.D.

Correspondence ID: 645 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Do what you can wherever you can to keep as much land as possible wild.

Correspondence ID: 646 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, I support Alternative B as a baseline, with noted adaptations

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 647 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My heart skips (with joy) at the thought of wildlife having their own protected habitat that will be their's forever!!

Correspondence ID: 648 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 649 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Please see my comments below.

Topic Question 3:
Yes, please see comments below.

Comments: I believe that Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 650 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

I support an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness, specifically measures that would:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I believe we should protect wilderness by reducing human imprint in designated wilderness areas.

Correspondence ID: 651 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, and I prefer alternative B, with modifications (below).

Topic Question 2:

The wilderness character of the area will be largely protected and allowed to take its own natural form. However, some hiking trails will be maintained, even though most of the land will be left undisturbed.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. See comments.

Comments: Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience. However to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that non-human activities will be kept to a minimum. However trail building and restoration, and minor, site-specific building and restoration such as a few minimal impact campsite construction and maintenance, and removal of campsites that prove to be a problem to keeping a wild experience will be allowed. Motorized and non-motorized vehicles should be excluded, except when needed for safety purposes.

Correspondence ID: 652 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach for Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 653 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 654 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B, with further modifications and provisions described below.

Topic Question 3:

1. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

3. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

4. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

5. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 655 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please consider the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 656 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I believe that this is a sufficient range of alternatives but that each would need to be "tweaked" to achieve the goal of any alternative.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B minimizes human impact and maintains the pristine and primitive nature of Olympic National Park.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the OlympicMountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 657 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect the Olympic Wilderness. Consider the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 658 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Bright Adventures Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 659 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please implement ALTERNATIVE B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 660 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
It is a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 661 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 662 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support option B

Topic Question 2:
I feel there should be absolute minimum of vehicular access to the wilderness spaces.

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 663 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
They span the possibilities.

Comments: I favor alternative B because it's the best way to preserve the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 664 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I believe Alternative B offers needed protection by reducing human impact. However, I believe this Alternative should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B offers a way to ensure this pristine wilderness remains safe from unnecessary impact.

Topic Question 3:
I believe Alternative B offers needed protection by reducing human impact. However, I believe this Alternative should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Please act in the interests of all Americans by doing the utmost to preserve this rare wilderness. Thank

you on behalf of my grandchildren and their future.

Correspondence ID: 665 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

They minimize human impacts, and preserve solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, the alternatives should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

Yes.

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 666 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, there are alternatives

Topic Question 2:
I have grave concerns about some of the alternatives. I only support option B.

Topic Question 3:
I strongly support reducing the human imprint on the Olympic Wilderness. Therefore, I encourage the Park Service to prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies, and prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Once violated, the Wilderness will never be the same, so I encourage the Park Service to leave cultural resources undisturbed and confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 667 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:
They are improvements over the current policy

Topic Question 3:
As above

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 668 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the best way to manage this Park. Most of it is wilderness, and so it should remain. This is a trust for the future. We've lost so much and must carefully guard what remains.

Topic Question 3:

Prohibit motorized equipment and vehicles except in emergencies. Prohibit new structures and inessential development. Do not disturb cultural resources, and let natural processes prevail over such resources and operate unimpeded. Wilderness areas and the back country should not be developed with interpretive trails. Leave it wild. This region is too important. Don't infringe upon it.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 669 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	670	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I do support the following:				

1. I do support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 671 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B

Topic Question 2:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 672 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I like alternatives that enhance the qualities of wilderness & reduce human impacts.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and

modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 673 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The range of alternatives could be broader but I support the model given in alternative B, albeit with some modifications.

Consequently I shall focus upon the latter in my comments, which give greater detail concerns these modifications that I consider desirable if alternative B is to be greatly improved.

Topic Question 2:

They encompass a range of suggestions so that additional issues can be brought up and considered (as in my comments).

Topic Question 3:

Although I support alternative B I regard it as vital that the modifications put forward in my comments section be incorporated into this alternative as crucial components of it.

Comments: As a biologist, I support the management approach described in Alternative B. However I also consider the following provisions and modifications highly desirable:

Firstly the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, should be prohibited except for their use in emergencies. Even research activities and other administrative functions should adhere to these rules.

Secondly new structures, installations and developments should also be prohibited, unless they are essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Trail shelters and cabins are structures that distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Thirdly nature trails should be kept to the front country and should not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 674 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation: Member

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. 1. I the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 675 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 I support Alternative B. B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness;

Topic Question 2:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I just came back from a week in Olympic National Park- the first week in May. It is gorgeous. The existing walking paths and hiking trails are more than enough to let visitors see the splendor of the park and its three eco-systems- temperate rain forest, Pacific coast and mountains. Please don't put in more roads or allow motorized vehicles. Let the wilderness stay wilderness. It restores the soul.

Correspondence ID: 676 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 Yes, this is a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 677 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: So much of our wilderness has already been ruined by development, drilling, pollution, and logging.
Enough is enough!
The wilderness is supposed to be a place of peace and quiet for us, and the wildlife which live in it!
The animals are running out of places to live and be safe. Our wildlife are under threat from so many angles. They desperately need to be protected, mainly from humans.
Life is hard enough for people, let alone the animals.
Can't we please offer them some much needed help?!
PLEASE save the wilderness for all future generations before it is permanently ruined. Some damage cannot be undone!

I support the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Sincerely,
JAKE HODIE

Correspondence ID: 678 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternate B is the best option.

Topic Question 2:

Option B is better then the current option, but needs some modifications: Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

-prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

-leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

-allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

-confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 679 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness

Topic Question 2:
see comments below

Topic Question 3:
see comments below

Comments: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 680 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
see below

Topic Question 2:
see below

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 681 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 682 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: NPO Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience). Furthermore, no hunting should be allowed.

Topic Question 3:

lternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 683 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support Alternative B.

Topic Question 2:
See below.

Topic Question 3:
See below.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 684 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
see below

Topic Question 2:
see below

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 685 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support alternative B
the less interference with natural processes the better

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 686 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Reducing the human footprint on natural habitat and wilderness environment needs no "alternatives". It requires enforceable and enforced public policy that reasonably assures observational access, while simultaneously negating as much of the environmental impact of such access as possible.

Topic Question 2:

Nothing other than what assures minimizing the human ecological footprint on pristine wilderness

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: It is incumbent on the human species to respect and foster optimal living conditions for all life forms by maintaining natural ecological balance and integrity in the face of what on the surface may appear to be natural alteration, e.g., wildfires, yet is actually a consequence of global warming.

This charge of duty is not a "dominion" issue, but rather, it's more akin to a trustee or stewardship relationship between humanity and the biosphere. Some ecological systems are so vulnerable and delicate that human interference can irrevocably alter their balance, if not damage them as habitat for other life forms. Embracing this challenge may indeed foster our own well-being.

Correspondence ID:	687	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: yes				

Comments: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	688	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: cherry valley environmental protection group Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes including both good and bad

Topic Question 2:
Any move to preserve the natural settings of the land is required and those alternatives are present

Comments: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B .

These are the best choices for the good of the land . The last thing any environmentalist wants is more access for the public thru motorized vehicles or any added noise pollution or any added building of any kind .

Correspondence ID: 689 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Comments: I am writing in support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 690 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Wide Range

Topic Question 3:

I support Alternate B, but would like it to specifically limit motor vehicle use, except emergencies. Limit new structures, and only let back country trails, not interpretive trails in the wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	691	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	692	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Alternative B is a good start, but needs to be expanded and modified, as noted below in "comments".				

Topic Question 2:

I favor maintaining wilderness areas in their most untouched state possible. That is, after all, what "wilderness" means.

Topic Question 3:

Do not allow hunting of any kind within the wilderness area.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 693 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B offers the most protection. With the population ever growing, it is essential that we protect the remaining wilderness. John Muir was right.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, the most minimal of human impact is the most desirable.

Comments: I still follow the Sierra Club motto of take only pictures, leave only footprints. I feel it my moral obligation to protect the wild as much as I can. That includes making some area unavailable to me.

Correspondence ID: 694 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wildernes.

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Comments: Please Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the provisions and

modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID:	695	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	696	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 697 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The best choice to maintain the wilderness character of Olympic Wilderness is alternative B: an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

It is critical to maintain wilderness areas as unimpaired by human uses. I like option B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness. Our natural heritage is more threatened than ever and we must take this choice.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment

Correspondence ID: 698 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, it is a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

I like that Alternative B reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness. This is the only alternative that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 699 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
PLAN B

Leave Mother Nature and ALL Animals alone in natural habitat

Topic Question 2:
PLAN B ONLY

Don't like alternatives

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 700 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please leave the wildness undisturbed. And no use of recreational vehicles and helicopters , only in the case of emergencies.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 701 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 702 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

I am pleased that Alternative B is included, which I am in favor of, because it most closely adheres to the intent and vision of the Wilderness Act as passed by Congress. However, I do think Alternative B can be strengthened, as detailed below.

Topic Question 3:

Please prohibit the use of motorized transportation, including helicopters or other aircraft, except in the case of emergencies.

Please prohibit any structures from being built in the Olympic Wilderness. These are not compatible with the intent of the Wilderness Act. The only exception should be structures that are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of wilderness character in the Olympic Wilderness. Existing structures that are a legacy of Forest Service management should be dismantled.

To the greatest extent possible, allow natural processes to occur. The only exceptions should be for minor restoration activities to restore campsites or trail damage, or for the removal of existing structures that detract from wilderness character.

Please limit established, maintained trails to the front country, and do not allow for their extension into the wilderness.

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EIS for management of this great American wilderness area. It is a treasure that belongs to all of the American people, and we owe it to our posterity to manage it in the greatest possible accord with the intent and values contained within the Wilderness Act.

Correspondence ID: 703 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Maybe

Topic Question 2:

Option b seems the best. Restrict motorized vehicles and building.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 704 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

They, for once, offer options that show greater concern with preserving AND maintaining ecosystems unblemished by demographic or profit-making concerns.

Topic Question 3:

I think that the alternatives should present the potential of fiscal and public health damage along with the implied

short-run economic "gains" of, say, having recreational activities put in place in one of the few relatively unblemished natural ecosystems left in our country.

Comments: I support the alternative that reduces human impact and interference with the Olympic Wilderness, including the following:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	705	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes.					

Topic Question 2:

We support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	706	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

I can support alternative B only. The other alternatives negatively impact wilderness values within the park.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. I support alternative B with the following modifications: 1) prohibit the use of motorized transport, including helicopters, with the exception of emergencies such as SAR; 2) prohibit the building of new structures; 3) leave cultural resources undisturbed regardless of their status; 4) allow natural processes to occur in the wilderness with the exception of minor repairs to trails or mitigating campsite damage, etc; and 5) insure that nature trails only exist in the frontcountry, not the backcountry.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 707 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B but would like to see the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 708 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative B - minimizing human impact in the Olympic National Park. ONP has been rated as most isolated wildernesses left in the lower 48. Please don't ruin this. Even living in Colorado, roads due to natural gas drilling is bringing human impact more and more into our wilderness areas. Does the West want to look like the eastern portion of the U.S. where upon looking at a map, almost all the land is criss-crossed by roads and human settlement? If human impact is to grow, lets preserve pristine large portions of wilderness for future generations.

Correspondence ID: 709 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes. Alternative B is superior

Topic Question 2:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 710 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 Yes I believe it is.

Topic Question 2:

They are a way to enhance the the value of Olympic National Park.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments: I would just like to say that I support alternative B. Please do what ever you can to keep ATV's OUT OF THE PARK! Besides tearing up the ground and the plants they are a way for people to pack in more trash.

Correspondence ID: 711 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

Only alternative "B" is viable.

Topic Question 3:

See comment.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	712	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Only B please				

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only one that meets the purposes of the wilderness act.

Topic Question 3:

please see below

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	713	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 714 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Not quite. Please see comments below.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B can be amended to address most of my concerns.

Topic Question 3:
Please refer below to my specific comments about Alternative B.

Comments: Regarding Alternative B, please include the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 715 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

I like b. It will protect our National Parks the best.

Comments: Our National Parks are our Treasures. This is why people come to the U.S. To see our National Parks. If they are not regulated and protected from people and big business from exploiting them, then we have nothing. My husband and I visit the National parks when we go on vacation. We respect and obey the rules when we are there. We need not sell out our rights to big business, we need to preserve our rights to our National Parks. We are the people and the people in Washington D.C. need to preserve what is ours.

Correspondence ID:	716	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	In the management plan for the Olympic Wilderness area of the Olympic National Park, please implement Plan B, which will best maintain the authentic wilderness character, and provide the best wilderness experience among the options offered in the plan.				

Correspondence ID:	717	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications: a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules. b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains. c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail. d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures. e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.				

Topic Question 2:
Less of a Human foot print. I am a fan of "Leave No Trace".

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	718	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:

Eliminating the use of motorized vehicles, except in the case of emergencies, is a good start to any wilderness plan. Limiting or banning the construction of new structures maintains the wild in wilderness.

Comments: Alternative B is the strongest alternative to protect the Olympic Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 719 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: The US Government needs to stop being a puppet of the rich and the greedy, psychopathic corporations who think they literally own the entire world and everybody on it. Please stop putting the wants of the rich and greedy above the needs of everything and everybody else!

Correspondence ID: 720 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Disabled American Veterans Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, the range of alternatives is good. Maybe a modest effort to include access for the disabled.

Topic Question 2:
B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, but alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Comments: To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 721 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I believe that limiting the imprint of humans on the lands that were set aside for Wildlife is very important. The Olympic Wilderness is home to so many different animals that to intrude on the habit would be a shame.

Topic Question 2:
There are many places that people can use their off road vehicles. Why do they need more? If they want to see nature up close get out and walk.

Comments: I know the the Earth will endure no matter what we do. It is just that we as a species won't be here to enjoy it.

Correspondence ID: 722 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, the range is fine.

Topic Question 2:
I like alternative B that primarily supports wilderness protection as opposed to development.

Topic Question 3:
Emphasis should be on maintaining natural processes and minimizing human disturbance.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 723 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 724 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	725	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Self Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Hello, I write to urge the NPS to:				

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	726	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 09:22:57				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2: alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy				

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), but it should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	727	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes,

Topic Question 2:

The only one acceptable is Alternative B that prohibits human interference with the wilderness. A wilderness should be for the wildlife and environment not for humans at all. Wildlife needs protection from continuous human interference and encroachment.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 728 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

It provides a vision closest to what I would like to see in management of the Olympic region.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments: I support to adoption of the practices provided in option "B" of the proposals.

Correspondence ID: 729 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 730 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

I like alternative B, in that it provides the most natural course. I would prefer the human footprint be as far reduced as possible.

Topic Question 3:

I feel there should be an aspect of alternatives (specifically B) that states that natural processes should operate unimpeded. Additionally, restoration activities should proceed without human intervention when at all possible.

Comments: I thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID:	731	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:

There seems to be a wide spectrum of options being considered in the four alternatives but to remain true to the purpose of the Wilderness Act I believe alternative B is the best option given it's goal to reduce the physical human imprint in the wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

In alternative's A, C, and D I think there is either not enough change in the management plan (e.g. Alternative A) or too much manipulation/development of the wilderness (alt. C and D.) Given that a primary goal for Wilderness as stated in the Wilderness Act is for it to function on it's own and that humans would be only a "visitor" I think alternative B is the best choice as it gives import to lessening the human footprint and hopefully allowing the land to function without unnecessary manipulation. With that in mind I would hope to see the following provisions and modifications made:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	732	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	733	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	734	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 735 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 See below

Topic Question 2:
 see below

Topic Question 3:
 see below

Comments:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 736 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

There are no acceptable alternatives except Plan B. Please be responsible and implement Plan B.

It will leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

It will allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Topic Question 3:

Leave natural processes alone. Let them operate unimpeded.

Comments: Please implement Plan B.

Correspondence ID:	737	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	Yes.				

Topic Question 2:

B & C are both an improvement over the current plan.

Topic Question 3:

Please see below.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 738 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: NPCA and about 40 others Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
They contain an adequate range of choices.

Topic Question 3:
Yes. See my comments, below.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B, with these modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless they are essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, except as necessary to assure their preservation.
- d. confine nature trails to the front country. Do not develop interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 739 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 740 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: University of New Mexico Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please maintain the strictest policy to keep the Olympic Wilderness pristine.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 741 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

While sufficient range has been presented I suggest:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

As stated above, alternative B with suggested additional changes meets the intent of Wilderness Preservation.

Topic Question 3:

See Above comments.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 742 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	743	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: I congratulate you on your work in creating this range of alternatives.				

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach as described in Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

Please include the following provisions and modifications to Alternative B:

1. Ban the use of motorized vehicles and equipment, except for emergency use, such as in medical evacuation by helicopter. Require research activities and other administrative functions to abide by these rules.
2. Do not allow the building of any new structures, including trail shelters, cabins, or other installations and developments unless these structures are critical to protect wilderness.
3. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, let natural processes prevail.
4. Limit restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage, removing unnecessary structures, and using best management strategies to remove invasive species.
5. Limit nature trails to the front country; do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I support Alternative B because it offers the best strategy to meet the purpose of the Wilderness Act: it minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience). To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, however, I encourage you to modify Alternative B to emphasize that natural processes be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views. The Olympic Wilderness is a truly stunning place and I want to see its wilderness values preserved and protected.

Correspondence ID: 744 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness

Topic Question 3:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Wilderness should remain wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 745 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Lakelas Mint Chapter of the Florida Native Plant Society Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation, however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the least invasive.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 746 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 747 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Pray we keep these sites wild, not deformed by man's corruption and pollution!

Correspondence ID: 748 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 749 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

THANK YOU FOR CONSIDERING MY POINT OF VIEW.

CAROLYN FRIEDMAN

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	750	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes.					

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only acceptable alternative for the park.

Topic Question 3:

- prohibit use of motorized equipment and transport
- leave cultural resources undisturbed
- limit human engineered restoration activities
- no new roads or trails!

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 751 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I like best Alternative B which keeps human impact at a minimum. I would hope that this would imply not building any new buildings or trail cabins and keeping ALL vehicles and helicopters out of the entire back country wilderness, including research and maintenance, except for extreme emergencies. Please keep the back country wilderness wild. It is a VERY special wilderness region, unique and beautiful. It should be preserved in its own wildness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 752 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act. It minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 753 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: NO organization Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I think so with modifications as listed under Question 3.

Topic Question 2:

The management approach described in Alternative B generally improves the protection of real wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

1. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

3. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

4. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

5. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 754 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: National Parks Conservation Association Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The alternatives provided are adequate although some modifications should be included. See response to question 3.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B) This is the best option to meet the purpose of the Wilderness Act. It minimizes human impacts, preserves solitude and the outstanding opportunities for primitive and back country recreation.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. The following additions to Alternative B should be included:

1.Prohibition of the use of motorized equipment and transport except in emergencies. This includes research activities and administrative functions.

2.Prohibition of new structures, installations and developments unless they are essential to the protection of wilderness.

3.Cultural resources should be left undisturbed.

4. Natural processes should operate unimpeded. Restoration activities should be minimal and confined to trail or

campsite repair or removal of damaged or unnecessary structures.

5. Nature trails and interpretive trails should not be included in back country areas/wilderness.

Comments: Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Correspondence ID: 755 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 756 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Wilderness should be just that - WILD. Uncivilized. Uncontrolled. Any attempts to exercise any level of control over natural processes destroy wilderness, by definition. Let the wilderness be.

Correspondence ID: 757 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Probyn Gregory Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, Alt B is my choice.

Topic Question 2:
Leaves natural processes undisturbed, as they should be.

Topic Question 3:
No structures built

Comments: Alternative B is the clear choice.

Correspondence ID: 758 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Without the entire document in front of me, it's hard to say. In general, I prefer the strongest and largest wilderness area.

Topic Question 2:
There seems to be a good range of options.

Topic Question 3:
Language supporting the strongest protection for wilderness should be included.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 759 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
For the present time, yes.

Topic Question 2:
The opportunity to preserve the wilderness and protect it from motorized vehicles, construction or development of any kind, and allow it to function as a wild area.

Topic Question 3:
No.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and

modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 760 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:
Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Correspondence ID: 761 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No. Only one alternative, (B) meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

Only one alternative meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	762	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2: no motorized vehicles except emergency equipment, no extraneous structures, repair of trails and campsites only, respect for wilderness and its inhabitants.				

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	763	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: See below.				

Topic Question 2:

See below.

Topic Question 3:

See below.

Comments: I support the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 764 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Thnese are the items that I believe should be strongly considered in any management plan for Olympic National Park. If the alternatives don't adequately address or include the key issues facing the Wilderness, then neither will the final plan.

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 765 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No

Topic Question 3:

My suggestion is to draft a wilderness stewardship alternative that reallocates staff and budgets from wilderness maintenance, restoration and monitoring in order to expanding specific non-wilderness areas for the benefit of those visitors who want to see, but not necessarily use, the wilderness.

Comments: The ONP is a world class park with inadequate facilities and resource allocation to address the demand from the majority of visitors. Staff and budgets should be focused on increasing the quality of experience of day

visitors rather than wilderness management. The General Management Plan should be amended to allow decommissioning specific wilderness areas so that world class facilities-roads, day use trails, viewpoints, rest rooms, etc.- can be installed to meet the expectations of park visitors and who contribute to the local economies. Healthy communities make healthy parks-but the park needs to do its share.

Correspondence ID: 766 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 767 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Given the proposed Alternatives, I strongly urge the Park Service to adopt Alternative B.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B bans motor vehicles (except in emergency rescue operations), which is essential to preserving wilderness.

Also, it leaves trail development to the front-country only & no trail development in the back-country.

Comments: Please be vigilant in preserving the wilderness in Olympic National Park.
It is very important to do this, without compromising on issues of pollution.

Correspondence ID: 768 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives B and C are most appropriate for wilderness conservation.

Topic Question 3:

I think that alternative B is best, yet it should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to continue unimpeded. All restoration activities need to be conducted through natural processes with a minimum of human intervention.

Comments: Alternative B is the best option for meeting the Wilderness Act. It is critical that human impacts be minimized, and that the wilderness experience is preserved. Solitude, freedom from noise and light pollution, primitive and natural surroundings, minimal human impact and unconfined recreation by foot are all important aspects of wilderness that should be the center of any plan.

Correspondence ID: 769 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I agree 100% with your Schedule B.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 770 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 771 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing in support of Alternative B. This is a lovely area, which I visited a year ago. It should be kept in as natural a state as it can. And there should never be any off road vehicles of any kind, or motorized machines. It tears up the forest floor and it doesn't fit at all with a wilderness area. We can use as much land as possible that is as pristine as possible to leave to future generations that will help them live better. Kay Licina

Correspondence ID: 772 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

I prefer only Alternative B to keep the Wilderness Wild and undisturbed. I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

I submit the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Please protect this precious wilderness area from human and machine pollution and development!

Correspondence ID: 773 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am asking that you consider the following points when deciding on a drafting management plan for the 876,400-acre Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park.

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.

Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you,
Shary B

Correspondence ID:	774	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	775	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	776	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the best.
Alternative C is the next best.
None of the rest are good in my view.

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 777 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I oppose any drilling proposal in the Olympic National Park.
As a park, I understood it is protected for perpetuity from such activities such as drilling, hunting, or removing the natural resources. The purpose of protections was to make sure future generations have a park to visit. This proposal does not effectively meet all users needs and is not sustainable for protections of perpetuity.

Topic Question 2:
Of the alternatives, I prefer the less impacting and less polluting option.

I restate my position:
I oppose any drilling proposal in the Olympic National Park.
As a park, I understood it is protected for perpetuity from such activities such as drilling, hunting, or removing the natural resources. The purpose of protections was to make sure future generations have a park to visit. This proposal does not effectively meet all users needs and is not sustainable for protections of perpetuity.

Topic Question 3:
Please explain why this is considered a viable idea to even consider as a proposal. It appears all shareholder voices are not being regarded, future park use and value to resources an International Company plans to remove out of our park and nation.

I strongly oppose any proposal regarding drilling or any lease of public land for removal and an international company to gain profit on an irreplaceable "resource" which is my heritage and national pride. I am a native Washingtonian, I am unable to remove my bias that the land should be protected and conserved not destroyed and used up for an international company's short term gain. The cost is too high.

I restate my position:

I oppose any drilling proposal in the Olympic National Park.

As a park, I understood it is protected for perpetuity from such activities such as drilling, hunting, or removing the natural resources. The purpose of protections was to make sure future generations have a park to visit. This proposal does not effectively meet all users needs and is not sustainable for protections of perpetuity.

Comments: I oppose any and all drilling proposals in the Olympic National Park or any Washington Park, the Bureau of Land Management and public lands.

As a park, I understood it is protected for perpetuity from such activities such as drilling, hunting, or removing the natural resources. The purpose of protections was to make sure future generations have a park to visit. This proposal does not effectively meet all users needs and is not sustainable for protections of perpetuity.

Thank you for considering the collective long term gain and my concerns today.

Most Respectfully and Sincerely,

Tess Morgan

Citizen

Volunteer Ecological Restoration - Duwamish River Greenbelt

Correspondence ID:	778	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park: Alternative B is the best: It minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

PROTECT, PROTECT, PROTECT! These wilderness areas are all we have left to maintain the health of our planet, and, sadly, that might not be enough.

Topic Question 3:

Please take the most extreme measure you can to protect the most wilderness possible. Remember, we human tend to destroy.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	779	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 13:54:16				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Alternative B is the only option that upholds the provisions of the Wilderness Act under which				

the Olympic National Park wilderness areas were originally protected. To adopt either of the other two alternatives would be illegal under the law!

Correspondence ID: 780 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Olympic Park Associates Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 14:01:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

The alternatives keep the focus on preserving wilderness character, with human access, preservation of historic structures, and commercial considerations given an appropriate back seat.

Topic Question 3:

I agree fully with the recommendations of Olympic Park Associates.

Comments: With the FAA allowing limited "hobby" use of unmanned remote controlled aircraft ("drones"), and soon to allow commercial use, I challenge Olympic National Park to be at the forefront of drafting regulations to ensure that any such use be consistent with the wilderness character of the Park.

I know it sounds alarmist, but before you know it, some yahoo is going to be offering real-time video "tours" of the High Divide, Mount Olympus, the wilderness coast, you name it. Or offering to resupply long-distance hikers with fresh food from flying caches.

PLEASE, NO DRONES IN THE WILDERNESS!

Correspondence ID: 781 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. It appears to me that Alternative B is the only alternative that is somewhat sympatico with the Wilderness Act via reduction in human impacts, protection of solitude, and provides outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. But Alternative B is weak and must be strengthened. See Question 3.

Topic Question 2:

See Question 1, above.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is not protective enough. The National Park Service (NPS) should modify Alternative B so that natural processes are allowed to operate unimpeded and that restoration activities (except site-specific trail or campsite damage or removal) is done by natural processes with very little human control

Comments: It is very important that NPS adhere to what the Wilderness Act says. I have visited, camped, backpacked, and hiked in Olympic National Park (ONP). I want to keep ONP as wild and natural as possible. Unlike some, I do not believe wild and natural conflict. They are two sides to the same coin.

The NPS must ensure that:

1) No motorized equipment, including helicopters, except for absolute emergencies. This includes research and administrative activities which must adhere to the Wilderness Act's restrictions.

2) No new structures, installation, and development unless they are essential to the protection of wilderness. This

means that NPS must take "untrammelled wilderness' seriously and not give it lip service. There is no need for trail shelters and cabins in ONP. They are not absolutely essential to the protection of wilderness.

3) Cultural resources should be left in place. If Nature decides they will disappear so be it. Wilderness trumps cultural resource protection every time.

4) Nature trails should be kept in the frontcountry. It is not legal to place highly developed interpretive trail in Wilderness. There is no justification for this since these trails are not needed for Wilderness protection.

5) NPS must allow natural processes to operate without interference. No human manipulation.

Correspondence ID:	782	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Wilderness Society Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

I suggest to the National Parks Service to focus the work effort on the alternative B.

Topic Question 2:

For my understanding, alternative B, prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transportation, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

In addition, alternative B, prohibits new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Also, leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures. Finally, confine nature trails to the frontcountry, DO NOT INCLUDE HIGHLY DEVELOPED or interpretive trails in the wilderness. Thank you for this opportunity of sharing ideas and suggestions.

Topic Question 3:

Most of the answers on those elements are expressed in the above question 2. Thank you.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	783	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	784	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

The listed alternatives seem to cover the options.

Topic Question 2:

They offer clearly defined objectives.

Comments: I am writing about the alternative plans proposed for the management of the Olympic National Park in Washington. I recommend these points of focus. I believe we should

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 785 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Comments: I support the following:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 786 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B is the only one that meets the protection objective of our wilderness area.

Topic Question 2:

Only Alternative B. It would actually accomplish what is necessary to protect wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

1. I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
 - a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Our wilderness areas are a great gift and asset to every human being. They are the best of our world and we must recognize their value and protect them as best we can. I am hopeful that all who are involved with this, have that as their motive.

Correspondence ID: 787 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am writing in support of the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

These provisions would protect the wilderness area better than any other approach. I would like to see the wilderness remain wilderness, with the fewest possible human interventions.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 788 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 789 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Viable and enablability

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments: I support the management approach in Alternative B, including prohibiting the use of motorized transport except for emergencies; only allowing buildings necessary for park service management; allow natural processes to proceed unimpeded; and confine nature trails to the frontcountry.

Correspondence ID: 790 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
I support Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Please support a totally unfettered natural environment, free of human intervention. These are our last refuges, and once they are gone or damaged, it is forever. The wilderness areas do not belong to government or business; they belong to the people and their posterity alone. You must protect them from all outside influence.

Correspondence ID: 791 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

See comments below

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B(there should be D and E as well) allows the least human impact of the alternatives. Please see comment below.

Comments: The response to population growth canNOT be to "improve" wild areas or there will be none left. I call this THE ACCESS RULE. "More people are going there, so let's add a bathroom and pave the road!" Therefore more people go there. "Oh look, there are even more people going there, so let's now widen the road and add paved trails." So now even more people go there. " Let's add a visitor center" etc. etc.
When will humans learn to leave things alone ? Humans seem like dogs needing to piss on everything to mark their presence.
I don't even like summit registers. LEAVE IT ALONE !
If trails are not used enough, let them disappear.
The Wilderness Act has a name, implying the desire by so many citizens to have some places, at least, not "improved" or "developed" by man.

There is great value for the human soul in reaching a place by hard effort afoot where the signs of humans are invisible or fading fast from someone's recent visit. Some would say that such places are worthless unless they can be accessed more easily by trail or road on motorized vehicles. They should keep to the places already allotted for their noise and pollution and erosion.

There is also great value in the realization that the world is NOT just about us. These places have just as much value and right to exist as any human who ever existed...even if no human ever goes there. These places need to be hard to access due to the so many humans who need to "mark" wherever they go in some anachronistic Victorian Manifest Destiny fashion. In the lower 48 there are some forms of roads within 20 miles of EVERY spot! What still passes for "wilderness" needs all the protection and limits to access that we can intelligently muster.

Correspondence ID:	792	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 15:23:13				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: I would like to provide my input on your proposed Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) for Olympic National Park (ONP). First I will say that even though I read the Peninsula Daily News (PDN) on a daily basis, I did not hear anything about the plan until I read a letter to the editor about it in the PDN on March 14, 2014. Yet your newsletter says you have been working on the plan since 2013 and received public comments on the plan last year.

I retired and moved to the Sequim area 13 years ago for the specific purpose of being near ONP so I could enjoy hiking in the park. When I read the proposed WSP it caused me a great deal of consternation because it appears that one of the main intents of the plan is to restrict access to the park for day hiking, which is my main hobby. Any kind of quota system designed to restrict day hiking would penalize locals like me who use the park on a spontaneous basis, such as to go hiking when the weather is good. Permits likely would not be available on the day of the hike, and getting a permit the day before the hike would involve a drive from Sequim to Port Angeles and likely a wait in line, thus effectively ruining the day. Even if some sort of phone or on-line permitting system is used it would necessarily involve some sort of filtering system such as waiting on hold on the phone, or some other queue-type of system on-line in order to restrict the number of people who are granted permits. A quota system would favor visitors from out of the area who come here on preplanned trips, and who would therefore make their reservations well in advance.

Your proposed alternatives B, C and D in the plan would all establish quotas for day use at ONP, which means all the retirees and other people living in the area who may have moved here in order to be close to ONP will be negatively impacted. In addition, the Port of Port Angeles commissioners pointed out in an article in the PDN on April 24, 2014 that "all the preliminary alternatives the park has proposed would reduce visitor access to the park and damage the area's economy." Given the dramatically negative impact your proposed alternatives would have on individual users of the park as well as the economy of the area, I would expect the park to have presented some very good reasons for the proposed changes. Yet I am at a loss to find any substantive justification for the proposed

actions.

I might be inclined to agree that quotas are necessary if you were to provide statistics showing that daily trail usage at high use trails in ONP exceed limits established by national standards. For example, how does the daily usage at individual trails in ONP compare to the daily usage on trails at parks like Yosemite that already have quotas in place? Using other methods to attempt to show that there is too much usage of certain trails could be subject to various types of bias. For example, certain trails may show evidence of what could be interpreted as excessive wear and tear when in fact the problem stems from inadequate maintenance because the park has chosen to use their resources for nonessential services rather than trail maintenance.

Another area of potential bias is in the interpretation of what certain concepts like solitude mean. What each person thinks of as solitude is a very personal matter and varies widely among different individuals. For ONP to suddenly declare that certain trails are overused and no longer provide a suitable level of solitude without providing the public with any kind of objective proof of this gives the appearance that this judgment is purely subjective. The newsletter says the park 'collected and analyzed additional data about wilderness resources, and completed a visitor use study'. Yet it was not disclosed where we can access this study, nor were the results of the study disclosed. For all we know from the information provided in the newsletter, the study could have shown that ONP is not at all heavily used like more popular parks such as Yosemite that already have quotas on day hiking.

Because of the significantly deleterious effect your proposed alternatives would have on the area I would like to suggest a different alternative. The purpose of my proposed alternative would be to build public support for any proposed changes. Without public support, any changes that have a negative impact on the area would raise a public outcry that would likely draw politicians into the controversy. The last time negative changes were proposed by the park was when they wanted to raise fees. They proposed that most of the money raised by the higher fees would be used for a wide variety of nonessential services that would have had little or no value for regular users of the park. On the other hand, they proposed that very little of the money would go for much needed maintenance, which is the only thing of value for regular users of the park. Thankfully the proposal died when the park superintendent decided to retire.

I propose that a three year study be launched of the park in which the actual number of people using each trail would be recorded. It would be necessary to perform a three year study because the summers can vary so much around here that a study based on a single year could show atypical results. Some summers it is cloudy and rainy all summer long, while on other summers it is sunny and warm all summer. Trail usage when the weather is good far exceeds usage when the weather is poor. The study would count trail usage for all high use trails on every day all throughout the warm season. This would be important because usage on weekends far exceeds usage on week days even at the height of the busy season. If quotas were imposed on a blanket basis, meaning for every day of the week, it would cause an unnecessary inconvenience for people using trails during the week when quotas would not in any way be necessary.

If such a study showed that usage of certain trails at ONP consistently exceeds what is considered high usage on a national basis, it would be easier for people to accept quotas, especially if the quotas were tailored to actual conditions at ONP rather than based on standards that were developed for truly high usage parks like Yosemite. For example, the busy season for ONP may be considerably shorter than at Yosemite, and usage of high use trails at ONP may only occur on weekends. Quotas could therefore be limited to weekends only, and for a shorter season than at Yosemite.

I would also like to propose that ONP launch on a trail building campaign to take some of the pressure off high usage trails. For example, currently most trails that run parallel to rivers do not actually run close enough to the rivers to see the river. Most were designed to get from point A to point B in the shortest time, and the destination point is not the river. For a lot of people, however, it is not the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow they are after, rather it is the silver in between. This especially applies to day hikers who just want to enjoy a short hike along a river without being particularly concerned with reaching a mountain lake (or whatever) at the end of a long trail. The Upper and Lower Dungeness trails are good examples of trails that run right next to the river so you can see the river and enjoy its ambiance along much of their lengths. On the other hand, the Lovers' Lane trail in the Soleduck area is a good example of most trails that run along rivers in the park. On a map Lovers' Lane trail appears to run along the Soleduck River, but in reality the trail is so far from the river along most of its length that you cannot see the river. The system of trails in the Elwha River valley illustrates a better use of trails in a river valley. The Elwha River Trail runs parallel to the Elwha River, but is so far from the river that you cannot see the river from the trail. The purpose of the trail is to provide the quickest route for backpackers to get up to high country areas like Elkhorn and Dodger Point. On the other hand, for day hikers who just want to hike a ways along a river and enjoy some sights there is a system of trails spreading throughout the Elwha River valley that branch off from the main Elwha River Trail. Some of those trails run to cabins while others run along the river. Perhaps there are other areas in the park where new trail

systems could make better use of river valleys, thus allowing more hikers and backpackers to use a given trail system without creating a more crowded wilderness area.

Finally, I would like to compliment the park on the current work being done on the south trail leading from Lake Ozette to Sand Point. Much of the boardwalk is being replaced by gravel, which should make the trail less hazardous during the rainy season, which is most of the year. I have slipped and fallen on that boardwalk so many times that I now largely avoid it during the rainy season. Usually it is a loose board, or a bouncing section of the boardwalk, or a section of the boardwalk that is out of level that causes the slip and fall. I hiked south to Yellow Banks and returned by the same south trail so I don't know if the north trail is also being fixed, but it needs it also.

I would like to express one minor quibble I have with the park about these trails at Lake Ozette, however. I hiked these trails for 20 years from 1960 to 1980, and for the last 13 years. During those times the park started minor repair projects countless times, but abandoned those repair projects before coming anywhere near to completing just the minimum repairs needed. In the process they would abandon piles of lumber and other building materials next to the trails, sometimes covering those piles in blue tarps. Often those piles of building materials have been left in place for so long that they have actually rotted in place even though the wood is cedar. The net effect of ONP's approach to maintenance of the Lake Ozette trails to the beach is that those trails have always been in a constant state of disrepair with often seriously dangerous sections of boardwalk left unrepaired. Serious injuries could result from someone stepping through a rotted board on the boardwalk and breaking a leg or hip. The second thing is that as a result of ONP's phlegmatic approach to repairs on these trails, there have been unsightly piles of building materials left sitting in the open or under rotting blue tarps right next to the trails for the whole 33 years I have used those trails. I ask that this time you finish what you start and repair the entire lengths of these trails, and that if you wish to cache spare building materials for future repairs that you develop some specific caches out of sight of the main trail. This shouldn't be hard because the underbrush is so thick along the trails. Although the boards used for repairs are heavy, they can easily be carried by two people so it should not be that much of a challenge to cut a few 30 yard trails off the main trail where permanent caches can be established. In the Lake Ozette area ONP has been responsible for not maintaining the wilderness character of the trails to the beaches for decades. Let ONP set the example first before blaming trail users for detracting from the wilderness experience.

p.s. My recent visit to the Lake Ozette trails was on 5/11/14, which was a warm, sunny Sunday. When I arrived at the parking lot around midday, there were no more than a dozen vehicles in the parking lot. When I returned to the parking lot after a day of hiking at around 8:00 p.m. there were six vehicles in the parking lot. Clearly there is no need for quotas at this time of the year.

Correspondence ID:	793	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 3:

1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	794	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support the following Points:				

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

2. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

3. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

4. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

5 allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

6. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	795	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Almost. Alternative B is close , but I would like to see the following provisions/modifications:

1) Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, *especially* helicopters which utterly destroy the wilderness experience, except for emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

2) Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

3) Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

4) Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

There seems to be some variety of options, though it's hard to discern at times and the wording seems intentionally vague.

Topic Question 3:

See my response to Question 1, i.e., I would like to see the following provisions/modifications to Alternative B:

- 1) Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, *especially* helicopters which utterly destroy the wilderness experience, except for emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- 2) Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- 3) Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- 4) Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I'm very concerned about the slow loss of wilderness to development in this country. I think Wilderness needs to be the ONE place we all know we can go to completely escape humanity and utterly immerse ourselves in nature. No damn helicopters, no chain saws, no motorized vehicles, and no loud music. I recognize all these are goals of the NPS' management of Wilderness, yet time and time again I see more and more development in the backcountry, more vehicles, and more excuses to use helicopters. This is a pandora's box. There is no reason all tasks in Wilderness cannot be completed with non-motorized equipment, just as humankind did for millennia before the invention of industrial machines. We can all experience enough industrialization and machines in the rest of our lives, but we need to have at least one place we can go to escape. And if that is not Wilderness, then I'm very concerned for humanity (and the planet that we will bring down with us).

Please let the true goal of Wilderness dictate the changes you are about to make. Do not let development trump the pristine, untrammeled experience that make the nation's Wilderness areas world treasures.

Correspondence ID: 796 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, it is clear a lot of effort has gone into preparation of the alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

I like alternative B, clear and concise.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments: I support Alternative B for the Olympic Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 797 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules;
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains;
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail;
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures; and
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 798 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Keeping the Wild Country wild. No motorized equipment or transport. No new structures to interfere with the wildness of the park.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 799 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and otherb. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 800 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please do the best for the environment

Topic Question 2:
Plan B is the best

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 801 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 802 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I prefer alternative B

Topic Question 2:

it is the best available option

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 803 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 804 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 805 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 806 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.i

Correspondence ID: 807 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
I like B. Where there is the least human interference!

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments: How lucky you are to still have such a beautiful and natural area! Where animals and trees can continue to exist!
Safe from the destruction of people/corporations! I like option B, that keeps human invasion to a minimum!

Correspondence ID: 808 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
I like item B. I think people should have access to wilderness areas but I also think we need to keep our footprint as small and unobtrusive as possible.

Topic Question 3:
Go with B and I think we will be good!

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 809 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: 250 Jenny Lind Drive Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 810 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please see my response below.

Topic Question 2:
Please see my response below.

Topic Question 3:
Please see my response below.

Comments: Dear NPS,

Please keep the Olympics and ALL (!) the nations great natural resources free from greed and politics. Your task is to be stewards of the National Parks, the biodiversity and precious natural resources of our great, fortunate nation.

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 811 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.
-

Correspondence ID: 812 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Sufficient

Topic Question 2:
Alternative

Topic Question 3:
None

Comments: Please implement Alternative B as it fits with the wilderness society goals.

Correspondence ID: 813 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 814 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 815 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
alternative plan b is the best plan

Topic Question 2:
because it keep motorized vehicles out and lets nature prevail and allow no structures to be built .

Topic Question 3:
no alternative b seems resasonable

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 816 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I have a further suggestion regarding wildlife. I would like to see wolves returned to the Olympic peninsula and the safest place would be within the park boundaries.

Topic Question 2:
I like allowing nature to take over wherever possible. The removal of the Elwha dam has already helped to restore the natural water resource and the fish population.

Comments: As stated earlier, I would like to see wolves return to their native habitat on the peninsula. They might need to be reintroduced from another part of the state where they are currently more plentiful. It would save them from the people who "shoot, shovel, and shut up" and I know we have such nefarious types in northeast Washington and, infamously, in Idaho.

Correspondence ID: 817 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
They give the wilderness a chance to stay that way, except for (D).

Topic Question 3:
No.

Comments: I long for the thrill and exhilaration of backpack in the wilderness or primitive areas. They were some of my best experiences, but very challenging, kind of like raising children while working full time. I agree with limiting human footprints, and you don't have to be that creative to figure that snowmobiles, hunters, and RV's effect the wildlife. Too many stresses on wildlife effect the population dynamics. I wish I would have done more backpacking and fewer contact sports, and all of my joints do, too.

Correspondence ID: 818 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 18:10:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I believe that wilderness preservation is vitally important to the park. I would like to see additional alternatives that are more specific to the local situations within the park. When reviewing the map and detailed descriptions, the trail framework, coupled with the option descriptions does not adequately account for local variations in use patterns.

Topic Question 2:
I like that the NPS is addressing this issue.

Topic Question 3:
Yes, I would like to see more localization in the plans - with specific management plans for each section/corridor outlined in detail.

Comments: I would like to see more detailed, localized management plans that take into account both historic use and more importantly, "highest and best future use" of the various areas and corridors in the park.

I feel very strongly that commercial use of the park should be curtailed. Specifically, commercial use tends to destroy the 5 values of wilderness character as identified in the documentation. Commercial use is typically at odds with the concept of citizen stewardship. Furthermore, commercial use permits, such as fishing guide fees, are woefully underpriced and do not adequately compensate the Park (and the taxpayers) for the negative impacts to the wilderness experience.

A primary focus on foot access in the wildest corridors will go a long way to preserving the wilderness experience.

The use of stock is also of serious concern to the wilderness character of the park and needs to be limited. The negative impact of stock on the environment is well-documented as is the impact on the experience for non-stock users.

I support measures to reduce the impact of the sports fishery, while maintaining non-commercially guided, catch and release access for individuals to all existing, established fisheries. Examples of ways to reduce impact would include: No commercial guiding in the Park. No fishing from a floating object (a proven successful management tactic in rivers here in the West), additional gear restrictions to promote sustainable catch and release fisheries, etc.

I would also suggest a fee for fishing in Park waters - and make it significant enough to be a source of revenue for

habitat enhancement and enforcement. Having 1 day, 3 day, 7 day and one year license options would be effective. Another concept would be a classification system with a pay to play element for key fisheries.

I also strongly value the power of enforcement. Unfortunately, it is all too common to see people abusing our collective resource in the Park, especially on it's rivers and trails. Alas, it is a rarity to see a ranger willing to write a ticket.

I do believe that a "wilder" Park is a good thing - and can be achieved without limiting most established vehicle access. Limiting the use that has the most impact on wilderness - commercial use, stock use, etc will go a long way to a wilder and better park experience. Coupled with increased use fees and enforcement, a wilder park can be a reality.

Correspondence ID: 819 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: save our wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 820 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

seems that the information and maps are not sufficiently detailed or that a decision has been made not to expand access to areas under utilized at present. this is after all a national park and is to be made accessible to people ranging from able bodied to physically disabled. It is one of the few parks which allow pack animals into the interior and if that is further curtailed would lead to less use. preservation of certain pristine areas and watersheds is good thing but not really a reality.

Topic Question 2:

most are little more than rehash of past policies that futher restrict access. not everyone has the funds to travel to olympic wilderness areas, pay the fees and rent the equipment required therefore making it an unfair practice.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 821 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The range of alternatives is sufficient.

Topic Question 2:

I fully support Alternative 'B' with the complete range of protections it specifies.

Comments: I support Alternative B's management approach as it best address the appropriate approach per the intention of being a 'Wilderness' area.

Correspondence ID: 822 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:**Received:** May,15,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Topic Question 1:

Aside from taking no action at all (option A), the other 3 at least show initiative.

Topic Question 2:

B) an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness; C) an alternative that emphasizes biophysical resource protection, but largely through management actions and manipulations; and D) an alternative that emphasizes a variety of backcountry recreation opportunities. While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 823 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch; Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I only support Alternative B because I support reducing the physical human imprint in the wilderness of Olympic National Park.

Topic Question 3:

1. It may already be included but there should not be snowmobiles or other motorized vehicles. These vehicles disturb the animals and are detrimental to their natural well being.
2. No additional buildings should be built unless absolutely necessary to the operation of the park and the safety of park visitors.
3. No new trails should be built.

Comments: During the years of 1975 to 1990 I used to visit my mother who lived in Port Angeles, WA. While visiting her I would travel up to the park and enjoy the wonderful scenery of Olympic National Park. It is the only park in this country that has a beauty that comes near the Swiss Alps.

I was 37 years old at that time and now I am 66. During one of my trips up to the park headquarters in late fall or early winter I remember standing off to the side of the parking lot across from the building and looking across a meadow with heavy mist covering the meadow. There were deer that you could just make out in the mist and the mountains were behind them. In the 30 years since that visit it remains one of the most beautiful sights I have ever seen in my lifetime.

We must protect the wilderness aspect of this beautiful park for current and future generations. Olympic National Park is a wonderful gem for our park system and this nation. I am counting on nps to protect this wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 824 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As I understand it, there are four alternatives, and I support Alternative B with some modifications.

Topic Question 2:

I like the basic premise of Alternative B but feel it doesn't go far enough.

Topic Question 3:

These modifications should be added to Alternative B:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

To implement, Work with Wilderness Watch, Nature Conservancy, The Wilderness Society and any other knowledgeable environmental organizations to keep the truest terms of the Wilderness Act.

Comments: I am 82 and have seen way to much damage done to our national parks and and forests since I was a youngster visiting them. My grandchildren and great grandchildren are not able to get the same enjoyment I did from such national parks as the Grand Canyon and Yosemite and Lake Tahoe because of over development, air and water pollution, and noise pollution. I would like to save and improve on this important heritage and national resource. Our wilderness areas protect watersheds, among other things.

Correspondence ID: 825 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 826 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
PLEASE SEE BELOW, ON QUESTION 3

Topic Question 2:
PLEASE SEE BELOW, ON QUESTION 3

Topic Question 3:

What feels of poignant and major importance is the there is NONE of that invasive/noisy motorized equipment...gawd, all those beeps and motor-roars!
And DEFINITELY NO HELICOPTERS - mean kind of noise and of a vibration that is totally discordant to this very SACRED PARKLAND. Treat not this land like a war zone...it is a sacred PEACE ZONE. Keep it the pristine gift that it is...NO buildings or new structures built. No new trails built to mess up the peace and grace of natural parkland, no altering the natural landscapes in the park AT ALL -allow mother nature to do this herself in joyful cahoots with all the animals and birds and insects who are part of that sacred land!

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 827 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternative b is the best yet needs strengthening

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 828 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes Choose B

Topic Question 2:

At least two of them will not make things worse: A & B

Comments: CHOOSE B

Correspondence ID: 829 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing in support of Alternative B, including prohibiting the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Please confine nature trails to the front country, and do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 830 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Support the management approach described in Alternative B

Ken Bone

Correspondence ID: 831 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No. There should be one that clearly, unequivocally proposes to guarantee the utmost protection possible for this Park, especially the designated wilderness portion.

Topic Question 2:

I like only one, "B", but that alternative still does not go far enough to protect the wild areas.

Topic Question 3:

Any alternative that does not afford the most stringent protection should not be considered at all.

Comments: Having visited the Olympic National Park, I know it is one of the very few remaining intact jewels we still have in the Pacific Northwest and, indeed, in the entire United States.

Far too many areas have been whittled down- -or even eviscerated- -by destructive redesignations for the benefit of commercial enterprises. We have too few left to attack the ONP, even if it were not one of the most pristine and beautiful of all.

Alternative "B" provides the most palatable course of action offered. However, another alternative, one that makes total protection of all the wild areas of the Park the greatest priority, should be added, promoted, and adopted.

Correspondence ID: 832 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Mustang Way Equine Assisted Psychotherapy Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Personally I believe the only Alternative that you are offering that should even be entertained is Alternative B. With these additional provisions:

- 1- No motorized vehicles or equipment should be used within the wilderness that might disturb said wilderness.
- 2- Do not allow any new structures
- 3- Leave cultural resources undisturbed and allow natural processes to function unimpeded

Topic Question 2:
Nothing outside of Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:
Please see answer to first question.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 833 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I feel that B is the only viable alternative. C is OK, but not as good as B

Topic Question 2:
I like that B and partially C protects and enhances the wilderness and minimizes human impact.

- Topic Question 3:
- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
 - b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
 - c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
 - d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
 - e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 834 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:
Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 835 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B Please.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 836 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello. I am writing to say that regarding the Olympic Wilderness in the Olympic National Park, Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 837 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

They cover different bases, although, only option B seems appropriate for the nature of a wilderness area, to protect and conserve its' wilderness status.

Topic Question 3:

Option B should be modified to: emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 838 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
We support Alternative B because it provides the most wilderness protection.

Topic Question 3:

Make clear that natural processes will be allowed to take precedence over any other consideration. Let nature work her magic with minimal interference from us. Require the removal of old buildings that pre-date the wilderness classification.

Comments: We just visited Olympic National Park for the first time last month, and it took our breath away. This last shred of wilderness is precious, and should remain as pristine as possible for future generations. No heavy duty trails where they don't exist, no motorized recreation, no additional amenities, etc. The intrinsic value of wilderness cannot be sacrificed for short-term special interests. We believe that true wilderness is more important than any short-term human benefit. Please just leave it alone!

Correspondence ID: 839 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wildlife Habitat Conservancy Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I support the management plan in Alternative B

Topic Question 2:

Prohibiting motorized equipment and transports.
Prohibiting new structures
Leaving cultural resources undisturbed
Allowing natural processes to operate

Confining nature trails to the front country.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	840	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	Yes				

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Alternative C would be an improvement over the current policy.

Topic Question 3:

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	841	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B, to reduce the physical human imprint.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 842 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes. However, Alternative B is clearly the best path forward.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the least invasive and preserves the ecosystem as intended by wilderness designation.

Topic Question 3:
There are certain elements that should be ensured, including:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 843 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wildlife organization Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No- -reduce the physical human imprint in the wilderness- -this is a wilderness not a community park.

Topic Question 2:
Again- -if this is a wilderness, keep it that way by reducing the human imprint and allow the fauna and the natural wildlife the Eco-system they need to exist without human access.

Topic Question 3:
Reduce the total human impact by not allowing snow mobiles, atv(s) and any other noise and machine pollutants. It is a wilderness not a play ground for humans.

Comments: I have camped, hiked throughout the west, far west, including Alaska and Canada and only left my foot

prints- -nothing like the call of the wild- -let's keep the wild in the wilderness and limit destruction cÃ used by human interaction- -limit the imprint of hunters, trappers, recreational users who make money off the wilderness- - need less to say stop the lodging and mining industry from exploiting our national treasurers. I have camped in the Olympic National Park- -enjoyed many quiet and solitary days observing the natural beauty and the excitement of watching Mother Nature just be- -I hope u get it!!!

Correspondence ID: 844 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
Gives those who are interecasted in preserving the wilderness a choice.

Topic Question 3:
Yes. In plan B there should be more focusing on no motorized vehicles in the wilderness unless for an imergency and no manmade buildings in a wilderness and there should be no well maintained trails in a wilderness. A natural process should be allowed with no interference from people.

Comments: A wilderness is just that a wilderness. The in print of people should be kept to a minimum and mining and logging interests should be kept out. The land should be left alone and develope on its own as God intended for it to be. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 845 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy

Topic Question 2:
I believe that Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience)

Topic Question 3:
To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 846 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Well, it's not much of a range of alternatives if only one (Alternative B) actually upholds The Wilderness Act. But at least there's Alternative B.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B seems to be the only one that upholds the purpose of The Wilderness Act and minimizes human impact, preserves solitude, and opportunities for genuine wilderness experiences.

Topic Question 3:

To truly protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unhindered, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as fixing trail damage or removing campsites) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

It's crucial that Alternative B strongly prohibit motorized equipment (including transport, except in emergencies) and the building of new human structures.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	847	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

I think it is a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

I don't like all of them. I like alternative B. It seems to me to be the only one that adequately protects the parks. I think it's particularly important to prohibit motorized vehicles and activities in the back country, except for emergencies. Alternative B does that. I also like alternative B's prohibition of new buildings and requirement to minimize trail development in the back country.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	848	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

I think Alternate B is the closes one to the Wilderness Act intention. Alternate A would be next acceptable. C and especially D are too invasive.

Topic Question 3:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: I have hiked and backpacked numerous times there when I was a Washington or a California resident. I certainly hoped I had very minimal impact on the Olympic Peninsula and the Wilderness. Please keep human impact to the minimum and restrict development to as low a profile as possible.

Correspondence ID: 849 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
I like Alternative B, for reasons mentioned in comments.

Topic Question 3:
Again, I prefer Alternative B, as it best conforms to the Wilderness Act, and Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park is a wilderness. See comments below.

Comments: These comments support Alternative B for the management plan of the 876,400-acre Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park, Washington State, which park is part of NPS.

Please support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 850 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
Please support the management approach described in Alternative B.

Topic Question 3:
Please include the following provisions and modifications in Alternative B:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of

Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 851 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Please leave the park undisturbed as much as possible.

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 852 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,15,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

I like only B

Topic Question 3:

Alt. B is the only Alt. appropriate for Wilderness

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.

Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	853	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: protect our last remaining wilderness!				

Topic Question 2:

No OHVs, no shooting on public lands, no mining, drilling, logging or destroying our great natural heritage.

Topic Question 3:

i would prohibit any and all activities that would destroy any more wilderness!

Comments: We need all the environmental protection that our public lands can get. No more freebies to the lumber, oil, gas, mining or other industries. No more OHVs. We need more wilderness areas!

Correspondence ID:	854	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:

I like Alt. B

Topic Question 3:

Alt. B is where the NPS needs to be

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 855 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach [an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness] including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 856 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative B. It is the alternative which comes closest to fulfilling the requirements set forth in the Wilderness Act.
It is important that the NPS support the Olympic Wilderness such that human activities are strictly limited to those specified in the Act. Please do not expand to include other activities. It is vital that man imprint be the absolute minimum.

Correspondence ID: 857 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will

prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 858 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

A. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

B. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

C. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

D. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

E. Confine nature trails to the front-country, do not include highly-developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 859 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I believe the range of alternatives is sufficient, but Alternative "D" could be expanded to increase the number of opportunities for people to visit and experience the Park.

Topic Question 2:

I appreciate the attention to detail that the staff has shown in preparing the documents. I am in favor of Alternative D, where all purposes of the Wilderness Act will be met, with an emphasis placed on managing visitor use and recreation to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences.

Topic Question 3:

I would like the park to continue to maintain the existing trail network to allow continued access to all areas and preserve its historic structures.

Comments: PO Box 221
Port Angeles WA 98362
May 13, 2014

Sarah Creachbaum, Superintendent
Attn: WSP Preliminary Draft Alternatives

Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles WA 98362

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

It is a pleasure to write to you and add my opinion to the public comments on the draft alternatives for the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

Within the last few years, I have had the opportunity to visit the Park's wilderness areas and some of its historic buildings via the trail system and look forward to continuing my park exploration in future years.

I'm supporting Alternative "D", where all purposes of the Wilderness Act will be met, with an emphasis placed on managing visitor use and recreation to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences.

I would like the Park to maintain its historic structures and the current trail system in its entirety to enhance a wilderness experience for visitors, both young and old alike.

I am concerned that Alternatives "B" and "C" seem to suggest that human visitors, even those following "Leave No Trace" practices, are not compatible with wilderness areas.

Possible quotas for day use throughout the Park and an extension of camping quotas everywhere in the Park would be undesirable hurdles for visitors.

I am disappointed that many trails could be abandoned and the park's historic structures allowed to decay in some of the alternatives presented.

House Report 2247 on April 28, 1938, part of founding legislation for ONP suggested the park would ". . . render available to the people, for recreational use, this outstanding mountainous country, containing numerous glaciers and perpetual snow fields, and a portion of the surrounding verdant forest together with a narrow strip along the beautiful Washington coast."

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Kari

Correspondence ID:	860	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act					

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act

Comments: Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	861	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:

Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	862	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

Affiliation:

Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

Correspondence Type:	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No, not a sufficient range. See answer to Question 3.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience)

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will

be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 863 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
Alternative b see comment section

Comments: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 864 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Trout Unlimited Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Good Range of alternates, B seems to have the most positive impacts on the wilderness status.

Topic Question 2:
I like Alternate B as I said above

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 865 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The range is barely sufficient

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

See my comments below. Ensure that

1. The use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, is prohibited, except for in emergencies.
2. New structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness, should not be built.
3. Natural processes should operate unimpeded whenever possible.

Comments: Dear National Park Service,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft alternatives for the management plan for the 876,400-acre Olympic Wilderness, which makes up 95 percent of Olympic National Park. As a wilderness supporter, I urge you to do the following:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	866	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 867 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 06:28:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I don't like the alternatives at all. Wilderness should be just that-wilderness.

Comments: Plan B should be the only plan. In this day and age the earth, humans included, need untrammled space in a desperate sort of way. The earth is being devastated and torn asunder by humans and cannot survive in a healthy, non-homogenized way. Wild places should be places where the only sign of humans are a few trails from foot traffic.

In keeping with the Wilderness Act steer clear of our narcissistic societies bend towards everything being about and for the human animal.

Thank you,
Lenore Bussing

Correspondence ID: 868 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes and the only viable one is Alternative B.

Topic Question 2:

I Support the management approach described in Alternative B because it is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control. Specifically, the following provisions and modifications should be included:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 869 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, but alternative B is the best choice.

Topic Question 2:
I like alternative B the best.

Topic Question 3:
I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 870 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:
they are varied enough but need to be modified

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: Of the 4 alternatives I think alternative B most closely fits The Wilderness Act but it needs to be modified (as suggested also by environmentalists)to prohibit the use of motorized equipment and transport, prohibit new structures such as trail shelters, confine nature trails to the frontcountry and not include highly developed trails in the Olympic Wilderness among others. Also,the wilderness should be restored by nature and be left wild.

We must protect whatever wilderness we have left and I hope the Park Service will take these things into consideration and work with environmental groups to come to the best plan.

Correspondence ID: 871 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option I would support.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is the only option I would support.

Comments: 1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	872	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes.					

Topic Question 2:

They represent the range of opinion as evidenced by public interest.

Topic Question 3:

Reduce human management and manipulations (Alternative B) except in the case of minor campsite/trail repair or removal of trash or impromptu structures. Generally allow natural forces to impact wilderness trails and other features. No new structures for the benefit of wilderness users! And absolutely no motorized access by the public or by administrative personnel (this includes helicopters).

Comments: Most people do not venture beyond the first mile or two in any wild setting. Any human built interpretive signs or trails should be restricted to the parking areas. The wilderness quickly loses it's integrity if these intrusions continue into the backcountry. Our job is to protect the unique, and increasingly precious, wilderness character of the irreplaceable Olympic Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	873	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes					

Topic Question 2:
The alternatives are sufficiently differentiated.

Comments: I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	874	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 08:00:06				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

It is a reasonable range of alternatives. We prefer Alternative C, plus several elements drawn from Alternative B, as described in our comments below.

Topic Question 2:
Alternatives B and C reflect the protective mandates of the Wilderness Act, together with the National Park Service organic act and other laws applicable to Olympic National Park.

Topic Question 3:
In our comments below we suggest elements from Alternative B that should be added to Alternative C in the final plan.

Comments: We are happy to submit the following comments on preliminary alternatives for the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for Olympic National Park. I (George) am a native of Washington state and visited the park many times before my career brought me to the east coast.

Olympic National Park is a precious remnant of the wild Olympic Peninsula that was intact as recently as 100 years ago. So much was lost before the park was established - and around it since then - it would be a grave mistake to let any of the park land be compromised. The wilderness designation was made to give stronger protection to natural values than national park status in itself provided. The stewardship plan should recognize that difference.

We find that Alternative C is the best approach to managing activities in the wilderness area. It distinguishes between the more heavily visited areas in Zone 1, providing trails to places most popular with visitors in Zones 2 and 3, and recognizing more primitive trails and way trails in Zones 4 and 5 for the more fragile habitats and less-visited areas.

Well built and maintained trails can be helpful in preventing erosion and deterioration of the landscape. We compliment NPS on the use of trail standards for wilderness areas that help to preserve wilderness character.

We especially favor the prescriptions for Zone 4 with few maintained trails and Zone 5 with no maintained trails. These areas, the least touched by human activities to date, should be managed to keep their untouched wild character.

We support several elements from Alternative B. We urge you to zone the North Fork Sol Duc as Zone 4 and 5 to reflect the light use of this trail and the difficult access via fording the river. For the South Fork Hoh trail we favor Zone 4; this will make sure that one west side rain forest valley trail will be kept primitive, without heavy trail development and pack animals. We also favor Zone 3 for Shi Shi Beach, to help prevent overuse of this area.

With respect to historic structures: we support the decision not to consider historic structures as contributing elements of wilderness character. The Wilderness Act did not intend early-20th century structures to be grandfathered in as "historic." We favor the prescriptions for historic management in Alternative B, which are most consistent with the Wilderness Act. Old homestead clearings with exotic grass species should not be considered historic features; we favor letting natural succession take those back to native ecosystems.

Thank you for considering our comments. Please keep us informed of further action on this stewardship plan.

Sincerely,
George & Frances Alderson

Correspondence ID:	875	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	This wilderness is in the Public Trust for future generations! Hands off, please!!				

Correspondence ID:	876	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Please choose Alternative B, but modify it to emphasize that natural processes.

Correspondence ID: 877 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes. Support the management approach described in Alternative B with modifications..

Topic Question 2:

Minimal human impacts.

Topic Question 3:

Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Confine nature trails to the "front-country", do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 878 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 879 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I prefer alternative B. Needless to say, since this is a wilderness area, there should be no use of motorized equipment or access such as helicopters except in life-threatening emergencies. No additional structures such as trail shelters, etc. are appropriate. Nature trails should be confined to the front country, and signage in the wilderness itself should be minimized. Where historic structures exist in the wilderness, these should be maintained, but if they are threatened by natural processes such as flooding, then the natural processes should be allowed to prevail.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 880 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 09:10:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

They are clearly different from each other in concept and attitude.

Topic Question 3:

Probably, but I have no time to discuss them now.

Comments: Alternative B (reducing the human imprint in the remaining wilderness areas) is the only one I really trust. Alternative D is a close second, for it offers humans the chance to rediscover their intimate membership to the community of nature and to realize that nature-friendly recreation is indeed recreating her and themselves. Alternative A is unacceptably lame-assed, but Alternative C is the most dangerous

Correspondence ID: 881 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Miss Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Only B, with added provisions to prohibit the use of motorized equipment and transport, except for emergencies; prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting wilderness; leave cultural resources undisturbed, if they are threatened by natural processes, let nature prevail; limit human=engineered restoration activities to minor, site specific restoration; confine nature trails to the front country, do not develop trails in the wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 882 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I believe it is.

Topic Question 2:

I believe item B would be the best answer to save the area.

Topic Question 3:

All my life I have lived in a big city. I do love the out doors and I believe that they need to be protected even if we need to create some tuff protections to protect these areas.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 883 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

I only support plan B.

Topic Question 3:

no

Comments: I believe plan B is the only acceptable option to choose.

Correspondence ID: 884 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Mr. Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, there is only one option when it comes to the management of wilderness areas despite strong pressure for other alternatives. It was designated as a wilderness area because of its pristine nature and flora and fauna that are indigenous to that specific area. Do not allow motorized vehicles, including, helicopters, planes, except for emergency issues.

Topic Question 2:

Alternate B should be the only option. The wilderness, left to its own devices, will render its own specific agendas that turn out to be the healthiest ones.

Topic Question 3:

I feel management of this should be left to the wilderness itself. We as a race of people have tried to evaluate and control other areas of the world only to realize it was best left to its own devices.

Comments: The wilderness is best left to its own devices. Cabins, shelters, man made buildings only despoil the wilderness experience. We have more than enough of that type of stuff in the strip malls and towns of America that has lost all of its cultural values in the name of progress.

Correspondence ID:	885	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	886	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 887 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

These are interesting alternatives. The one thing that's missing is tourists.

I consider the Olympics (and specifically Olympic National Park) to be one of the top 5 of all American destinations. Ask the tourists! I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to spend time there a couple of times. And because it is so beautiful, I made sure to bring other tourists with me to appreciate the incredible beauty, mystery and awe-inspiring feelings I feel when there.

Topic Question 2:

For me, the only question is why we don't just say no to powerful energy interests which have reaped enormous profits while leaving destruction and pollution in their wakes. These areas should be closed to development, to frivolous activity (off road biking, helicoptering, etc.) Period.

Topic Question 3:

I hope I've made my feelings clear. True conservation is the only alternative.

Comments: See all of the above.

Correspondence ID: 888 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes, for the most part. I'd like to see more options to leave the wilderness alone or reduce our human footprint and enforce the rules.

Topic Question 2:

You've included "an alternative that reduces the physical human imprint in the Wilderness"

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I used to live in Tacoma, WA and I love the Olympic (and Cascadian) wilderness out there. I'd like to express my support for the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 889 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Buckhorn Range Chapter - Back Country Horsemen of WA Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,16,2014 11:20:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
None of the Alternatives are acceptable, except Alternative A. All others restrict access unacceptably, and eliminate stock trails. More stock trails are needed. There is also a great need for stock camps in the back-country, as well as campgrounds near trailheads that have stock facilities.

Topic Question 3:

The requirements for online permitting, permits for day hikes and rides, the requirement for bear canisters, and for human waste bags throughout the wilderness are draconian and unnecessary in this Park. There isn't the volume of visitors that occur in other Parks here, and the ecosystem is much more robust. The rules in place now regarding food handling and waste disposal/removal are adequate Perhaps requiring waste bags above the timberline would be appropriate.

You should be working to improve accessibility to the Park and its Wilderness, not restricting it. The elimination of the use of chainsaws to clear trails is completely unworkable and will result in the loss of use of many miles of trails. There are simply too many blowdowns in the Olympics to handle with crosscut saws only.

Comments: There needs to be a major reworking of this Draft Wilderness Stewardship Plan to improve accessibility to the Wilderness.

There needs to be provisions for obtaining permits at Visitor Centers and for trailhead registration. Please don't remove trails from the stock use designation as this would severely limit not only the ability to visit these areas on horseback but would also greatly impact the ability to maintain Park infrastructure. There needs to be more partnering with user groups and trails organizations like BCHW to enable the Park to continue to address the maintenance issues effectively.

Correspondence ID: 890 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I support alternative B.

Comments: I believe Alternative B would give the most protection to these lands that would ensure the quality of the wilderness for generations to come.

Correspondence ID: 891 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	892	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 893 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 894 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:
a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 895 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 2:

1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 896 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 897 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 12:47:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The range of Draft Alternatives is generally sufficient, provided that the Final Alternatives are freely amended to reflect public input.

Topic Question 2:

I appreciate that Alternatives B-D identify specific measures for increased wilderness protection, such as greater limitations on stock use (B-C), elimination of non-native species that pose a demonstrated threat to the Olympic Wilderness, and (Alternative D) online permitting for more reliable tracking of Park use.

Topic Question 3:

Areas of the Draft Alternatives that I feel should be modified concern primarily Visitor Use and Experience and include Commercial Services (and relatedly Fisheries), Permits, Quotas & Use Limits, and Food Storage. Please see the appended Comments for details.

Comments: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

As lifelong resident of the Pacific Northwest and a frequent visitor to Olympic National Park, I am pleased to provide comments on the ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan Draft Alternatives. After carefully reviewing each Alternative along with relevant supplementary materials, I find myself unable to fully support any of the Alternatives as drafted. Please consider these four amendments, which in my view would lead to improved Final Alternatives:

1. Commercial Services and Fisheries - fishing guides.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 provides (Sec. 4) that wilderness areas shall be protected from commercial enterprise except as deemed necessary for the recreational or wilderness purposes of the designated area. Despite this provision, the Queets River and its fish continue to be subject to the deleterious effects of commercial guiding. Commercial fishing guides on the Queets River exploit a publicly protected resource - native anadromous salmonids - for private gain while simultaneously diminishing the wilderness experience of other Park visitors. Daily impacts from guiding operations during the fishable season lead to substantially elevated pressure on the resource and reduced quality of fishing for unguided anglers, who comprise a significant proportion of visitors to the Queets corridor during the fall, winter, and early spring. While I appreciate the lands south of the Queets from the QIN reservation to the Queets Campground are not designated as wilderness, the lands on the north bank are, as are all of the lands upstream of the Queets campground, where many of the targeted fish are destined to spawn. Fishing guides should thus, at the least, be subject to Extent Necessary Determination.

It would be my recommendation, in accordance with the Wilderness Act and with the Park's intent to protect salmonid populations, that commercial guiding on the Queets River be permanently discontinued.

2. Day use quotas

Common to Alternatives B-D, language concerning the possible implementation of day use quotas is vague. Wilderness experience aside, the implementation of day use quotas could drastically affect Park users' access to wilderness. In principle, I am therefore opposed to day use quotas at all. However, if such quotas are to be implemented, the areas and seasons in which they will be implemented, along with use data that are thought to justify these designations, should be presented to the public for further comment.

3. Backcountry permits

Alternatives B-D specify that backcountry permitting will take place in-person (B, C) or online (D) only. The language implies that all permits will require an educational component. It seems excessive to require an educational component for each permit issued. A once-annual educational component would seem sufficient. [In support of Alternative D, an online system certainly seems more efficient than the in-person system suggested by Alternatives B and C.]

4. Bear canisters

Bear canisters are necessary in areas that lack bear wires or in backcountry areas lacking suitable trees for hanging bear bags. Requiring bear canisters in low-use backcountry areas with adequate tree cover for bear bags seems insensible, adding unnecessary bulk and weight to the packs of many Park visitors.

Thank you for your time, and for your efforts to improve Olympic National Park.

Sincerely,

Dr. Andrew D. Brown
Kent, WA

Correspondence ID: 898 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, with some changes

Topic Question 2:

That Option B reduces the human imprint in our beautiful Olympic Wilderness

Topic Question 3:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 899 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 900 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
It appears so.

Topic Question 2:
I support Alternative B, the modifications below.

Topic Question 3:
Yes:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 901 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 13:29:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
I think that they make you think about what parts do you like and dislike about each one.

Comments: As a 70 year old local resident who hikes in the wilderness (examples: Upper Royal Basin, Deception Basin and Lake Lillian) with my grandchildren, I would like them to be able to do the same with their grandchildren. I am concerned that there are too many people are in the back country that disregard rules or best practices by camping in places that are not allowed. Quotas might help with this, but the real problem is there is no enforcement. Rules are good, but if there is no funding for rangers to educate/enforce them, they become meaningless. We have a priceless treasure in the ONP wilderness and if we don't protect it with some rangers, we will lose some of it.

I am a part of the local community that is interested in the financial benefits of visitors coming to ONP. They come here because of the wilderness. Making the wilderness easier to get to by building more trails and roads is a benefit to some people, but is shortsighted because it destroys what they came to see.

I would like to see no new trails in the back country, particularly wide horse trails. I would like to see more short front country trails for visitors. I see no reason to maintain any of the shelters or buildings in the back country.

Thank you for protecting our wilderness,
John Bridge

Correspondence ID: 902 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, the alternatives seem to cover all bases.

Topic Question 2:

I appreciate that the preservation of natural quiet is being considered seriously. That is not addressed at all now, that I can tell, and I would like it to be a focus.

Topic Question 3:

I do not like Alternative B at all. I feel strongly that we need access to the Wilderness in order to enjoy and appreciate it. Reducing the number of trails and bridges makes the Park far less accessible. Without being able to go in to the Wilderness and experience all that it has to offer, it rather defeats the purpose of having it be a National Park. Yes, part of being a National Park is to preserve wilderness, and that's fantastic. However, we need to be able to get into the middle of this. With fewer trails, many people will likely not use the Park for recreation anymore. Others will continue to use the Park, but will travel off-trail much more often. This will cause damage to vegetation that wouldn't happen if people are kept mostly to trails. If bridges aren't replaced, pretty soon almost all the trails will dead end, and the unused portion of the trail will go back to its wild form. There will also be more danger to hikers, as many will attempt to ford or get across rivers by other means. I'm all for replacing the bridges with all native materials, but we need those bridges. We need those trails. I do not have a problem with not building any more new trails, but feel very strongly we need to maintain the trails and bridges we have, and replace/maintain bridges that connect two parts of a trail.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 903 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 904 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Solduc Valley Packers Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,16,2014 13:41:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

There might be another alternative, but these are the ones we have been given. Plan D seems to be the most flexible and to fit the Wilderness Plan of having a Heritage Park that is of, by and for the people. Changes in technology, weather patterns, fires, storms, tourism trends, economic changes define and impact Park users. This plan will be in effect for years to come. It is very difficult to devise a stewardship plan that is forward thinking enough with the limited foresight that we humans possess. Nevertheless, we will register our comments.

Topic Question 2:

I do not like much about alternatives B & C. Both of these alternatives appear to be quite radical, inhibiting public enjoyment of the Park and extremely costly to the taxpayers to maintain. In not maintaining trails, bridges and other structures, forcing people to carry their feces out in plastic bags rather than bury it all lead to the public not having access to what has historically been the people's Park. These plans are economically prohibitive to the taxpayers in that they require long range studies by high-end wage earners (biologists, scientists etc.) in addition to working with other government agencies (i.e. tribal, USFS etc). All this research, over a time frame of this length will cost millions of dollars that the American people do not have. Due to decreasing budget to operate the Parks these alternatives are cost-prohibitive and do not meet the requirements of having a World Heritage Park. The people who came up with these plans have not thought about how they will be able to get to their research areas when no trails or bridges are maintained.

Alternative D is a more reasonable approach to the resource management. Keeping historic shelters, providing maintenance of existing trails. Possibly increasing stock access by providing more campsites and trails for stock is vital to maintaining the trails we have as well as the possibility of building more trails for access.

Topic Question 3:

I believe that in nearly one million acres of Park there could be many more trails and camp areas for back country use and that this would reduce impact in some of the areas that get trampled constantly. I believe that having more stock camps is a necessity to maintaining the wilderness trails. Without a place to overnight with stock, the equipment needed to clear windfalls and maintain trail tread cannot be used. Having more overnight campsites for stock is also necessary to perform medical evacuations, which are often done by stockowners.

Some campsites designated as high use areas in the Superintendent's compendium are no longer high use areas due to fires, trail washouts etc. Some trails and campsites that have traditionally been stock friendly have not been maintained and have become dangerous for pack stock. The ONP should utilize its' stock volunteer force to get these trails put back into stock accessible condition, making access for maintenance, medical evacuations safer to stock users and the general public.

I believe that in almost one million acres of Park there could be many more trails camp areas for back country use and that this would reduce impact in some of the areas that get trampled constantly.

Comments: Public Relations with Business and Community

There are a great many ways that the Park can assist its' adjacent communities and provide the public with a better experience in visiting the Park, especially those who wish to travel into the wilderness areas. The Park should encourage and assist businesses that specialize in guide service (horseback/packers, backpacking, mountain climbing, outdoor adventure entrepreneurs in becoming licensed concessionaires. This would provide local people with jobs, as well as provide the Park with revenue (3% ohe gross income). These local partnerships do much to enhance the Parks image in the community as well as to provide safe, educational wilderness experience for the visitors. It makes more economic sense than hiring more Park employees who must be provided with wages and benefits. Many of these guide businesses are certified in Leave No Trace and back country wilderness navigation and probably have as much or more education and experience in guiding than those the Park could hire for ranger-guided tours. They also donate thousands of hours in trail maintenance while they are in the back country doing their guide business.

The ONP needs to continue to work with tribal authorities for access through tribal lands. When tourists need to Park on tribal lands to access ONP their cars are often broken into, and vandalized. In our 40 years living here, we have seen this occur at nearly every tribal access area to the ONP. This kind of vandalism does not promote a pleasant ONP visit. We have had this type of vandalism occur at the Shi Shi Beach area 2nd and 3rd Beach at LaPush.

Back Country Permits

The Wilderness Information Center (WIC) should not be prohibiting its licensed guides ability to fulfill their clients needs by requiring 14 days notice for backcountry permits. This inhibits the ability of the most skilled guides to take the most unskilled backcountry visitors into the Park. People who want to be guided need the assistance and education of these guides. These visitors are much less liability to the Park when they are assisted by a licensed guide. To limit the concessionaires ability to take visitors on short notice is entirely prohibitive. Licensed guides have incurred expenses fulfilling the requirements to be a licensed Park concessionaire. They must be given every opportunity to recover the costs incurred in purchasing insurance and fulfilling all of the Parks requirements as well as be a viable and profitable business. Neither the guides nor their clients have control over conditions (weather, economy, family emergencies, traffic) that change travel plans and necessitate last minute adjustments to their itinerary. Access to back country permits, especially by the Parks own licensed concessionaires must be very flexible and accessible.

Pack Stock Necessity

Because my husband and I are licensed mule/horse packing concessionaires and have volunteered thousands of hours in clearing Park trails with our stock, we feel very strongly that stock trails and bridges must be maintained in order for people to continue to enjoy our ONP. The chain saws necessary to remove these huge old-growth trees that frequently fall across the trail can only be carried in with stock. The ONP must be allowed to keep its' mule string for trail crew equipment. CHAIN SAWS must NEVER be prohibited in this Park. If we are forced to utilize crosscut saws to maintain trails in ONP, the cost of maintenance will be increased by millions of dollars per year.

Education:

The ONP must do a must better job of educating the public about how and why stock are so valuable to trail maintenance. Most of the users have no idea that the Park has a string of mules to keep the trail open. If more people understood this, they would not complain so loudly about manure on the trail. The Park has a website that can be accessed worldwide so why not use it to inform people about stock in the Park?

World Heritage Park:

We have a magnificent World Heritage Park that is visited by people from all over the world. The Park should continue to work with Friends of the Olympic National Park, Back Country Horsemen, and its licensed guides to promote public awareness. The Park needs to update its website to include links to other groups who can be helpful to visitors.

Locally, there a thousands of people in our local communities who have never stepped foot on a back country trail. Some see the Park as a place for tourists, but not for them. The Park is seen as an entity that is separate from the community. I like that Sarah Creachbaum is making an effort to change that perspective by speaking at Chamber of Commerce meetings and coming to the communities to help with the concept of stewardship plan. The small turnout at these meetings is indicative that many local people do not really value or understand why the Park is an asset to our communities. All they see is a gated pay station at the entrance of their Park.

The Park needs to be open with the public about what they are doing with the 2.4 million dollars annually that they receive in gate and camping fees. Local people need to know where all the money goes. The Park should be proactive in working with its volunteers to provide First Aid training, Leave No Trace programs and stock awareness. Take the Mule Barn Day to a new level by providing volunteer trail maintenance workshops and first aid in conjunction with Back Country Horsemen and your licensed packers! Volunteerism has increased 15% pyear in the Park. This saves the Park budget hundreds of thousands. Utilize the volunteer army that is available!

Correspondence ID: 905 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 13:54:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative C, with several refinements, best protects natural resources and ecological processes. The refinements my wife and I suggest include significant elements from Alternatives B and D. Please see below.

Topic Question 3:

From Alternative B, we suggest taking the recommendations regarding management of historic structures in Wilderness, quotas of visitors and use limits, limits on administrative use of aircraft and administrative use of tools. From Alternative C, we suggest taking the recommendations for Wilderness trail and campsite zoning, trail and bridge management, stock use, and campsite restrictions. From Alternative D, we suggest increasing ranger-led interpretative hikes, and tribal access to ethnographic resources within the limits of the Wilderness Act.

Comments: Specifically, from Alternative C, identify heavily used nature trails (zone 1); maintain popular access trails up river valleys and major passes (zones 2 and 3); carefully delineate primitive trails (zone 4) and way trails (zone 5); regulate camping in fragile, alpine and less heavily used environments; prescribe fewer maintained trails in zone 4; and no maintained trails in zone 5.

From Alternative B, Shi Shi Beach should be zoned 3 rather than 2; the old overgrown military road should not be reopened for trail use; the North Fork Sol Duc and Aurora Ridge should be zoned 4 and 5, primitive and way trail; and the South Fork Hoh and the Rugged Ridge trails should be zoned 4.

From Alternative D, the following trails should be zoned 2 and 3, traditional stock use should be allowed: the Queets River trail, the Dosewallips/Hayden Pass/Hays River trails, and the Boulder Creek trail to horse camp/former parking area at Olympic Hot Springs.

We oppose hazard fuel reduction activities to protect nonessential buildings in Wilderness. We recommend that the plan include a wilderness district for the Olympic Wilderness and a wilderness district ranger to oversee all park operations within the Wilderness.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important document.

Correspondence ID: 906 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
I completely support the management plan of Alternative B, which reduces the human imprint on the area. I feel very strongly about this.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 907 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Alternative B provides a good possibility and C is fairly adequate, but A and D are not good suggestions.

Topic Question 2:

Again, Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience)

Topic Question 3:

To fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Specifically, support the management approach described in Alternative B, including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration, such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the front country; do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	908	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

1. I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

In order to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness, Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 909 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Prohibit motorized equipment and transport except in emergencies.
2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting untrammeled wilderness.
3. Leave cultural resources undisturbed.
4. Allow natural processes to occur largely unimpeded:
limit human intervention to minor restorations such as trail repair and removing unnecessary structures.
Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 910 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:
No

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 911 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

I support alternative B and want current management to better fulfill the intention of the Wilderness Act.

Comments:

Please prohibit all motorized equipment and vehicles except for emergencies. Everyone should abide by those rules! Do not allow any new structures unless to protect wilderness and habitat. Let nature prevail. Do not take actions to preserve things that should not be there anyway ('cultural resources').

Please limit trails to the front country so that wilderness exists. Do not allow anyone to put trails in the wilderness. They will never stop. I am from the Northeast and over time many of our woods have become a lacework of trails. If anyone tried to make a list of human recreations the list would not be complete at 10,00 items. Yet, people will say that they must have, have the right to have, roads and ATVs and more in the wilderness. Humans are selfish and diminish the harm they do. People never stop. They never stop. They never stop. That needs to be acknowledged or you will not make the right decisions.

Please protect the Wilderness. Please believe in and fulfill the Wilderness Act. Our population overgrowth means that your work to protect Wilderness is more important than ever. Do not listen to loud, destructive voices. Keep to the ethics of the Wilderness Act.

Correspondence ID:	912	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	Yes				

Topic Question 2:

I prefer an alternative (B) in which there is little human interaction allowed - no motorized vehicles except in emergencies etc. The other alternatives allow too much environmental interaction.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	913	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	retired school teacher- no affiliation Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	yes there are sufficient ranges of alternatives and I prefer alternative B - leaving natural the entire park as is without				

interference of motorized vehicles, no habitation, no buildings. Nature adds nothing that is of mankind, only what should be.

Topic Question 2:

There are good choices but as I stated in the question 1 - leave Olympic Park unchanged as nature provided it.

Topic Question 3:

none

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 914 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
This is sufficient and Alternative B is preferable.

Comments: I fully support Alternative B!

Correspondence ID: 915 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I think that Alternative B should have excluded certain weakening of the required wilderness protections expected, so a stronger alternative with more restrictions should have been offered (if Alternative B itself was not strengthened).

Topic Question 2:

I like that there is one alternative that provides the high level of protection I feel is required under the Wilderness Act. I like that Alternative B minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience). This alternative can be improved though, in my opinion, and I provide my suggested improvements below.

Topic Question 3:

I am shocked that you would offer illegal alternatives. Two of the four alternatives (C and D) allow activities that are illegal under the Wilderness Act. I find it appalling that the managing agency would offer to allow activities which are contrary to the protections provided these lands under the 1964 Wilderness Act. Twisting the legal interpretations in an attempt to enable manipulations or controversial activities is not the way the National Park Service should be operating. I expect the BLM to offer shady decision making, but not the NPS.

Comments: I ask that the preferred alternative of the NPS be Alternative B.

I furthermore ask that the final management decision be Alternative B, but with the strengthening modifications provided below.

In short, I do not want manipulations of these resources in ways inconsistent with a strict interpretation of the 1964 Wilderness Act. I do not want definitions stretched to allow activities that are inconsistent with the Wilderness Act. Natural processes must be the only mode of change in these wilderness resources.

I want the final management plan to state explicitly the following:

1. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies.

Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

3. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

4. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

5. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 916 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

- The prohibition of the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport.
- The prohibition of new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness.
- Leaving cultural resources undisturbed.
- Allowing natural processes to operate unimpeded.
- Confining nature trails to the frontcountry

Comments: I urge the NPS to implement Alternative B in the management of the Olympic Wilderness in Olympic National Park.

Correspondence ID: 917 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 16:06:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

In effect, the March 2014 preliminary draft WSP provides only 3 alternatives (B, C, and D), given that Alternative A (status quo) reportedly cannot be considered or chosen. From the material that ONP provided, it is very difficult to determine the precise impact that the current Alternatives B, C, and D will have on certain crucial elements of the ONP wilderness, for example, the existing trails. However, it appears that the miles of maintained trails may decrease under each of the Alternatives. ONP should provide one Alternative with clear evidence of no decrease in maintained trail miles, as maintained trails are crucial to allow experienced hikers and climbers to reach and exit from some of the high, off trail traverses or climbs in the limited amount of time away from work that working taxpayers have to experience these wilderness adventures. ONP should also provide an Alternative that proposes more trails. The three Alternatives provided each appear more restrictive than the status quo and make it seem that ONP is biased toward restricting or preventing human access to the wilderness, when wilderness areas, under the Wilderness Act, "shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness". I strongly encourage ONP to tabulate in a grid or spreadsheet format all of the trails in the Park, and then specifically indicate how each Alternative would affect each trail. For example, ONP should indicate any decrease in trail maintenance or downgrading in trail status for each trail or segment of trail under the different Alternatives so that citizens can compare the impact of the different alternatives on specific trails and on overall trail mileage. This would allow citizens to more readily compare the impact on specific trails under the different alternatives. The information that was provided with the March 2014

version of the Alternatives was very ambiguous and difficult to decipher, making a comparison of the alternatives an exercise in frustration.

Topic Question 2:

I do not like Alternatives B and C because they are overly restrictive and would tend to discourage or prevent people from visiting and enjoying the ONP wilderness. Alternative D is marginally better than Alternatives B and C because D appears to provide for more access by people to the wilderness than Alternatives B and C, and because Alternative D also accords more weight than B and C to preservation of historic structures within the wilderness, which is more consistent with the Wilderness Act, read in its entirety, which includes within the definition of wilderness, "ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value". However, as indicated in my response to Question 1, I believe that ONP should offer more Alternatives than the B, C, and D Alternatives that were offered in March 2014.

Comments: I believe that it is critical that ONP maintain the existing trail system in ONP, as this is the most certain way of complying with the Wilderness Act, which mandates that wilderness areas "shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness". The trails in ONP do not impair the wilderness but instead make it possible for citizens to reach the truly wild areas and experience them. The difficulty of doing so even with trail access naturally limits the number of visitors and helps preserve the wild areas. Those who travel these trails or who go beyond the trails into the truly wild areas know how precious the wilderness within ONP is and will be more willing to help protect the park in the future against who would want to extract resources or engage in inappropriate development. Abandoning trails, downgrading trail maintenance or otherwise impeding hikers from using the park's existing trail system is the wrong way to go in preserving the ONP wilderness.

I also believe that it is essential that ONP maintain the existing historical structures in the ONP wilderness, as preservation of historic structures within the wilderness is consistent with the Wilderness Act, read in its entirety, which includes within the definition of wilderness, "ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value". The historic structures in the ONP wilderness existed for the most part before the Park and were present when Congress designated the area as wilderness in 1988, making them part and parcel of the wilderness, not something foreign or apart from the wilderness.

I believe that it is critical that chainsaws be allowed for use in clearing and maintaining the existing trails in ONP, because inefficient trail clearing caused by an insistence on hand-sawing ONP's numerous, large blowdowns would inevitably reduce the miles of trail open to public travel. To reduce the noise impact of the chainsaws, ONP should consider chainsaw models with advanced noise-attenuation features, if available.

Correspondence ID:	918	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Of the alternatives, I would like Alternative "A" the best, but I realize that it is insufficient as a true Wilderness Plan. I think the best plans are to have ngoals rather than specific delineated plan features which preclude flexibility in working towards those goals. I do not like the other alternatives which place trails in categories which may not be realistic.

Topic Question 2:

I like the idea of providing online registration for backcountry access and camping, but not at the expense of losing self registration and registering at WIC and other ranger stations.

Topic Question 3:

I do not think it is wise to place trails in the category of not being maintained. An unmaintained trail will be lost and ONP has lost many miles of trail over the years because of lack of maintenance. We can't afford to lose any more trails.

Additionally, I would like to see the bear wires continued to be maintained in the many areas that they are. This applies to the many backcountry pit toilets, as well. These features allow users to comply easily with the regulations. Removing these features invites widespread abuse.

I do not think we should limit access to any areas for dayhiking.

I also read this in the Other Items To Note: Other Features of Value Quality of Wilderness Character: The NPS has defined a fifth quality of wilderness character called, "Other Features of Value" based on the last clause of Section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act which states that a wilderness "may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value." and It has been determined that the only features within the Olympic Wilderness that will be addressed within the "Other Features of Value" quality of wilderness character are Native American resources (i.e., archeological resources, traditional cultural properties, and ethnographic resources.) This sounds as if Michaels cabin, Humes cabin, Enchanted Valley Chalet, ranger cabins, and trail shelters will no longer be maintained, which I strongly disagree with.

Comments: In general, the plan should make it as easy as possible for users to use and comply with the regulations. That is why having multiple ways to register is important. The Wilderness Plan should not only protect the Wilderness but make access to it easy and uncomplicated.

Correspondence ID:	919	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 2:				

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should include the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	920	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Washington Trails Association Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,16,2014 16:19:38				

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

N/A - - see Comments below.

Topic Question 2:

N/A - - see Comments below.

Topic Question 3:

N/A - - see Comments below.

Comments: *We are also submitting a hard copy of this letter by postal mail.*

May 16, 2014

Sarah Creachbaum, Superintendent
ATTN: Wilderness Stewardship Plan
Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Parks Wilderness Stewardship Plan - Preliminary Draft Alternatives. We appreciate the parks public engagement process and the opportunity to provide comments prior to the development of draft alternatives. The undersigned organizations represent over 30,000 members from Washington state who engage in active outdoor recreation in Olympic National Park and other public lands throughout the Pacific Northwest.

The Access Fund is the national advocacy organization that keeps climbing areas open and conserves the climbing environment. Founded in 1991, the Access Fund supports and represents over 2.3 million climbers nationwide in all forms of climbing: rock climbing, ice climbing, mountaineering, and bouldering. Six core programs support the mission on national and local levels: climbing management policy, stewardship and conservation, local support and mobilization, land acquisition and protection, risk management and landowner support, and education. The Access Fund encourages an ethic of personal responsibility, self-regulation, and Leave No Trace practices among climbers and works cooperatively with public land managers on conservation projects and management planning. A significant number of the Access Funds members live in the Northwest.

American Alpine Club, started in 1902, has been supporting climbers for the last century. Our mission is to support our shared passion for climbing and respect the places we climb. This is accomplished through our core values of providing authoritative climbing information, knowledge and resources, advancing our climbing interests through advocacy and leadership, and strengthening our climbing community through competency. We represent the entire spectrum of climbers in the United States from boulderers to alpinists, and help provide logistical support through industry partners and our rescue insurance. We provide grants to climbers travelling around the world, and also help fund stewardship projects around the country. The American Alpine Club has a large presence in the Northwest and many of our members climb and travel throughout the region.

American Whitewater is a national non-profit 501(c)(3) river conservation organization founded in 1954 with over 6,000 individual members and 100 local-based affiliate clubs, representing 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. The protection of wilderness waterways was among our founding principles. Olympic National Park is nationally recognized as a destination for backcountry paddling in a wilderness setting.

Back Country Horsemen of Washington is one of the four heritage stock use/packing organizations from four different states that joined together to found the national Back Country Horsemen of America in 1985 for the purpose of keeping trails open and assisting public land agencies with addressing management and maintenance

issues on our nations wilderness and non-wilderness lands. Currently, the Back Country Horsemen organization has chapters in 27 states and over 13,500 members. The national volunteer effort was determined to have a contribution value of 14 million dollars for 2013 which included 30,732 stock use service days. Members of the Washington state affiliate have long been partners with the Olympic National Park in addressing backcountry maintenance and education.

The Mountaineers, founded in 1906, is a nonprofit outdoor education, conservation, and recreation organization whose mission is to enrich the community by helping people explore, conserve, learn about and enjoy the lands and waters of the Pacific Northwest and beyond. Based in Seattle, Washington, we have over 13,000 members and guests in seven branches throughout Western Washington. We support over 1,500 skilled volunteers who lead 3,200 outdoor education courses and activities on everything from backcountry skiing, wilderness first aid, and avalanche safety to conservation education and advocacy. In addition, we provide over 4,000 opportunities for youth to get outside each year. Olympic National Park is an important 'classroom and recreational area for our members. Washington Trails Association was founded in 1966 and is the countrys largest state-based trail maintenance and hiking advocacy non-profit organization with more than 12,500 members and more than 2.5 million unique annual website visitors. Washington Trails Associations mission is to preserve, enhance, and promote hiking opportunities in Washington state through collaboration, education, advocacy and volunteer trail maintenance. In 2013 Washington Trails Association volunteers contributed 4,198 hours (\$90,000 value) of trail maintenance to Olympic National Park. Statewide, 3,400 individual Washington Trails Association volunteers contributed 108,000 hours of trail maintenance on federal, state and local lands in 2013.

Our organizations advocate for the conservation of wild places for the purpose of protecting the experiential value they provide. The Wilderness Act of 1964 states that wilderness areas shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such a manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment. It is the opportunity to use and enjoy Olympic National Parks wilderness, and specifically the opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation, that is important to our members who call this region home as well as those who travel here for the world-class opportunities that backcountry recreation provides in Olympic National Park.

We write to share our significant concerns with the alternatives provided for Visitor Use and Experience. We understand that a key goal of wilderness stewardship is to protect, restore and enhance the wilderness character of Olympic National Park and that a primary benefit of achieving this goal is for public use and enjoyment. Alternatives B and C are inconsistent with several aspects of the recently implemented 2008 General Management Plan and Alternative D does not meet the objectives outlined in the conceptual vision to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences. We support an additional Alternative E that meets the objective to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences and the objectives stated in the General Management Plan.

Introduction/General Description

We support the concept of Wilderness Zones to provide quantitative standards where management actions would be taken if acceptable levels of impacts are exceeded. However, the monitoring framework needs to be clearly articulated as part of the development of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the quantitative standards for acceptable levels of impacts should be explicitly defined.

Alternatives B and C include less infrastructure, which would be inconsistent with language in the General Management Plan stating that facilities such as trail bridges, ranger stations, historic structures, radio repeaters, toilets, and signs would be retained and could be improved if they are determined to be necessary to protect wilderness values or for public safety. While less infrastructure could lead to a more primitive wilderness experience, the minimal infrastructure present in Olympic Wilderness, as identified in the General Management Plan, is generally necessary to protect resource values and provide public safety: most of the wilderness area, away from trails and the park boundary remains pristine with limited or no distractions from modern society where natural conditions prevail. In the analyses of all alternatives, we request a review for consistency with the General Management Plan, as well as an evaluation of the impacts of reducing infrastructure on natural resources and public safety.

Types of Recreation

We are pleased to see the wilderness-compliant activities that our members engage in specifically listed as Common to All Alternatives.

Stock Use

We support current approximate mileage of stock trails, stock camps and group sizes. We would like pack goats added to the definition of 'stock'. We support the inclusion of language about the possibility of increasing mileage of stock trails, where appropriate to provide additional dispersed recreation opportunities and/or access to new or relocated environmentally friendly sites for overnight stock camps.

Campsites and Camping Areas

We support Alternative D's approach to camping areas and campsites in Olympic National Park. We believe that the number of campsites and camping areas should stay relatively the same as present, while some might increase or decrease depending on natural occurrences and needs identified by the park. This alternative is consistent with the General Management Plan that states, some wilderness campsites would be maintained, some could be increased, and some could be reduced in size or rehabilitated.

Commercial Services in Wilderness

The Wilderness Act specifically calls out commercial services as appropriate in wilderness stating that they can be provided to the extent necessary for activities that are proper for realizing the recreational or other wilderness purposes of the areas. In other words, nothing in the Wilderness Act or the General Management Plan for Olympic National Park suggests that commercial services should only be available for those who are mobility impaired as contemplated in Alternative B. Commercial services should be viewed as an opportunity to address many of the current challenges Olympic National Park is facing with wilderness management. With declining agency budgets and a decreased presence of rangers in the backcountry, commercial outfitters play an increasingly important role in teaching visitors how to safely enjoy the backcountry and protect the resource through Leave No Trace education. More importantly, commercial outfitters provide an essential service in getting people outside, particularly youth, who may not have the equipment, experience or knowledge to do so on their own. In A Call to Action, the National Park Service sets a goal of expand[ing] the use of parks as places for healthy outdoor recreation that contributes to people's physical, mental, and social well-being. Commercial service providers should be viewed as partners in achieving this goal.

We support commercial services to the extent necessary as outlined in Alternative D, but in a manner that would not result in detrimental effects on natural resources or reduced opportunities for members of the general public in areas where quotas may be necessary. Ideally, commercial services can assist in reducing impacts to natural resources by incorporating wilderness stewardship, Leave No Trace, and other wilderness related curriculum into all trips as outlined in Common to All Action alternatives. Among the types of commercial services provided, we recommend the inclusion of youth activities as an authorized activity in Olympic Wilderness.

Permits

Getting people out to experience nature is fundamental to the work of our organizations and consistent with the language and intent of the Wilderness Act. We believe that permitting is important to maintaining the character and beauty of Olympic National Park.

We support a permitting process that does not impede recreationists access to the park and also has a strong educational component related to Leave No Trace, wilderness values and safety, as listed in Alternatives B, C, and Ds Common to All Alternatives.

We are deeply concerned that eliminating the option for self-registration will limit access to the park. The General Management Plan states that permitting would continue under the current program. We oppose removal of self-registration stations unless alternatives are provided that allow for multiple ways to register for a permit (i.e. online, in-person and electronic permit station combined) with the same expediency provided by self-registration systems.

Currently, in-person registration is limited and does not easily allow for registration during the weekend and at the times when people often travel into the park, like later in the evening or early in the morning. Furthermore, the in-person registration stations are limited to only three locations in the park: Port Angeles, Quinalt and Hoodport. Any in-person permitting system should be it available seven days a week, with extended hours Friday-Sundays to allow for recreational access. Over-the-phone registration would also limit access based on hours and staff availability.

We support an online permitting system that includes an online educational component analogous to approaches utilized in other National Park units to allow access for those who cannot make it in-person during the hours the Wilderness Information Centers are staffed. We do not support an online-only registration system, as this could exclude access for members of the public who do not have internet access.

We have concerns about the varying locations and percentages for reservable quotas. We recommend that 50% of the space at each camping area be reservable, and 50% available through the permit office 24 hours before the start of a trip to create consistency and clarity among park visitors with the permit system. If specific areas are considered for a higher percentage of reservable sites, a justification and analysis needs to be provided to inform our future comments on draft alternatives.

In summary, we support the parks effort to improve the educational component of the wilderness permit registration process by requiring Leave No Trace, wilderness values and safety information. We ask that the park enhance the methods for wilderness visitors to obtain permits by incorporating a multi-faceted approach of in-person, online, and self-registration permitting systems. If executed correctly, this broad permitting system can improve the education component, reduce administrative costs, and improve visitor accessibility to Olympic National Park.

Quotas and Use Limits

Our members recognize that wilderness areas have social and ecological capacity for visitor use and that quotas can be an appropriate tool to manage the quality of the wilderness experience. At the same time, management restrictions on visitor behavior can degrade the opportunities for unconfined type of recreation. We note that the description of recreation as an element of wilderness character in the Wilderness Stewardship Plan - Preliminary Draft Alternatives Newsletter states that the quality can be degraded by facilities that reduce peoples self reliance or manage visitor behavior. It is more than just the facilities but also management restrictions and the analysis of alternatives needs to evaluate this trade-off between the need to balance the reality of social and ecological carrying capacity for recreational use with the impacts of management restrictions on visitor behavior that degrade the wilderness experience.

The alternatives statements on quotas are inconsistent with the Overarching Concept for each alternative. For example, Alternative D, which has a goal of providing a greater range of visitor experiences, would establish quotas for overnight and day use throughout the wilderness. Alternative B, which has a goal of providing a greater range of reducing the human footprint, quotas for day use would be considered for high use areas. We oppose the blanket application of quotas particularly if they will be implemented for day use throughout the wilderness. Permits for day use are utilized as a management tool in only a handful of areas that include such destinations as Half Dome in Yosemite National Park and The Narrows in Zion National Park. The National Park Service has shared that the area receiving the heaviest amount of use at Olympic is the coastal Wilderness. Day use quotas may be appropriate for areas on the coast and the Wilderness Stewardship Plan should evaluate this possibility. However, any alternative that contemplates this approach needs to include specific criteria for implementing such a plan and clearly defined guidelines that limit the application of this approach to specific areas with unique resource or social issues. Day use quotas at Olympic National Park should only be used as a last resort after all other wilderness management tools have been exhausted due to its limited use throughout the National Park System and the fact that it limits opportunities for use and enjoyment of the areas where such limits are imposed.

Quotas and use limits for overnight use are appropriate in high use areas when demand exceeds social or ecological capacity. As with day use areas, quotas should not be broadly applied throughout the wilderness but should be narrowly tailored to specific areas with unique and exceptional resource or social issues.

We acknowledge the impacts of group size on our public lands and believe in limits that work to mitigate these impacts. As such, we support the Use Limits outlined in Alternative A: groups camping in the park backcountry limited to a maximum of 12 persons per group; and affiliated groups whose combined total number of people is greater than 12 would continue to travel at least one mile apart. And that in specific backcountry areas groups of 7-12 people would continue to be required to camp in sites designated as Group Camps.

Food Storage

We strongly encourage the continuation of current food storage options in Olympic National Park. Requiring bear

canisters for all activities in the park would eliminate access for some recreationists, like paddlers, who cannot fit bear canisters in hard shell whitewater kayaks. Requiring bear canisters would also negatively impact multi-day trips and alpine ascents such as carry-over high-alpine traverses and bivies. We believe that permit holders should be required to use proper food storage as currently outlined in the Camping and Food Storage section of the Superintendents Compendium; that bear canisters, bear wires, bear hangs and rodent-proof food containers can all be proper food storage, location dependent; and that the park can increase education around bear issues to negate concerns about the possible future habituation of bears in Olympic National Park.

Waste Management

We support efforts to minimize the impact of human waste. Overall we support the ideas of Alternate A that are consistent with the General Management Plan. As recreationists, we seek to leave areas better than when we arrived. Based on this, we support waste management practices that include packing out human fecal waste in blue bags from any glaciated area of the park. We also support the evaluation of visitor use management strategies and new options for toilets as well as increased educational efforts as outlined in Common to All Alternatives. When evaluating new options for toilets, it is also important to determine whether current types of toilets are appropriate for the areas they serve (for example, composting toilets are often not realistic for high use areas or areas where regular maintenance is not available).

Campfire Restrictions

We believe that campfires can be an inspiring part of backcountry experiences and should be allowed in Olympic National Park. Similarly to Alternative B, we suggest that campfires be prohibited above 3,500 feet due to the fragile nature of alpine environments. We support the park in being able to assess resource impacts below 3,500 feet, but we request more detailed language around what exceeding acceptable standards means.

Maintenance of Trails, Bridges, or other Existing or Necessary Infrastructure

When Olympic National Park was designated in 1938, the expressed intent was "to maintain the park for a principal use as a trail park." We believe that having a maintained trail system does not negatively impact the wilderness character of the park. Furthermore, we appreciate the sentiment provided in the document Keeping It Wild in the National Park Service that states:

Wilderness is not intended to be an area of prohibitions that limits access and enjoyment, and facilities in wilderness are important aspects of visitor safety, experience, and resource protection.

We are strongly opposed to any reduction in mileage or maintenance of the trail system. This issue was evaluated during development of the General Management Plan and draft language that the number and class of trails would be slightly reduced from present was struck from the final document. We feel that the language of 'no new trails will be constructed' limits the ability of the park to account for future trends. With growing local and regional populations, as well as a growing number of park visits, we want to ensure the trail system is appropriately supported well into the future. We do recognize that some trails may need to be relocated due to environmental or habitat considerations, but the lack of available current maintenance funding alone is not sufficient reason to permanently close a trail or trail system.

We request an alternative that maintains the complete current trail system, continues the maintenance of bridges, and allows for increases in the maintenance status of trails. We support and request options that allow for more maintained trails in the park, including the possibility of bringing back abandoned trails into the maintained trail system.

Under the Facilities Maintenance: Trails category, we agree with Alternative D, in adherence with the Wilderness Act and the Minimum Requirements Analysis.

For Facilities Maintenance: Bridges/Water Crossings, we believe that bridges, foot logs and water crossing are integral features of trail and allow the public to access wilderness. We believe that these features should continue to be installed and replaced as needed and as outlined in Alternative A.

We believe it is important for the park to be able to improve how routes are signed, and request an alternative that allows for the inherent changes that happen in a wilderness environment, which may require an increase in route signage. Right now all three proposed alternatives would either reduce or keep signage as is, which could be limiting and impact the safety of visitors in the future.

We support the Common to All Alternatives recommendation around ABA Trails and Access.

We highly encourage the park to continue utilizing regional organizations that provide integral trail maintenance to the park. For example, Washington Trails Association, Back Country Horsemen of Washington and Student Conservation Association, as well as other smaller organizations, have provided thousands of volunteer hours to maintaining the parks trail system. We applaud Olympic National Park for meeting their 2016 National Park Service Centennial Plan for increasing volunteer service by 10% pr year from 2006-2016, and we look forward to supporting a further continuation of this trend.

Cultural Resources Management in Wilderness

We believe that historical structures play an integral role in experiencing wilderness here in the U.S. We oppose Alternatives B and C, as they are inconsistent with mission of the National Park Service, current 2006 National Park Service policy and Olympic National Parks 2008 General Management Plan. In addition, National Park Service policy clarifies and confirms its intent to maintain structures in wilderness in its January 2014 National Park Service publication, Keeping it Wild in the National Park Service - A User Guide to Integrating Wilderness Character into Park Planning Management and Monitoring.

We support the language and ideas outlined in Alternative D, and believe that the Minimum Requirements Analysis can and should be used to maintain historical and cultural resources.

Summary

Olympic National Park is the fifth most-visited national park in the country with more than three million visits per year (2013). People come from all over the world to visit Olympic National Park which has a tremendous positive impact for the local economies and communities surrounding the park. There are few places in the world where you can visit coastal, rainforest and subalpine wilderness in one trip. In short, Olympic National Park is an American treasure. With over 95% o Olympic National Park designated as wilderness, one can assume that almost everyone who visits the park either steps into or takes in the dramatic vistas of Olympic Wilderness. While our organizations are committed to protecting the last remaining wilderness in Washington state, we are equally committed to ensuring people can access and enjoy Olympic Wilderness in a variety of ways, from hiking to a mountain meadow, to climbing a rugged and remote peak, to paddling world-class whitewater, and horseback riding up a river valley floor, now and into the future.

To summarize:

" We do not support limiting recreational access to Olympic National Park or reducing the maintained trail system.

" We do support the concept of Alternative D in placing an emphasis on managing visitor use and recreation to provide visitors with [a] greater range of wilderness experiences. However we find that many of the recommendations for Alternative D appear to be inconsistent with the stated emphasis and with the parks 2008 General Management Plan.

" We support the idea of Wilderness Zones, but request clarity on the process to determine zones.

We encourage Olympic National Park to continue looking for ways to balance the needs of retaining and improving the parks wilderness character with the needs of those who love and want to enjoy Olympic National Park Wilderness - the two needs can and should live harmoniously together.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on Olympic National Parks Wilderness Stewardship Plan - Preliminary Draft Alternatives.

Sincerely,

Joe Sambataro
Northwest Regional Director
The Access Fund

Eddie Espinosa
Northwest Regional Manager
The American Alpine Club

Thomas O'Keefe, PhD
Pacific Northwest Stewardship Director
American Whitewater

Martinique Grigg
Executive Director
The Mountaineers

Andrea Imler
Advocacy Director
Washington Trails Association

Jeff Chapman
Public Lands Officer
Backcountry Horsemen of Washington

FOOTNOTES:

- 1 - 16 U.S.C. 1131(a)
- 2 - 16 U.S.C. 1131(c)(2)
- 3 - Olympic National Park, Final General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, March 2008, page 428.
- 4 - Olympic National Park, Final General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, March 2008, page 429.
- 5 - Olympic National Park, Final General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, March 2008, page 429.
- 6 - 16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(5)
- 7 - A call to action, preparing for a second century of stewardship and engagement. National Park Service, 2013, page 9.
- 8 - Olympic National Park, Final General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, March 2008, page 429.
- 9 - In Grand Canyon National Park for example river orientations that were previously presented by River Rangers, are now available online and visitors are encouraged to take advantage of these resources prior to arriving at the park: www.nps.gov/grca/photosmultimedia/riv-or01.htm and www.nps.gov/features/wilderness/leavenotrace/popup.html.
- 10 - Keeping It Wild in the National Park Service: A User Guide to Integrating Wilderness Character into Park Planning, Management, and Monitoring, page 9. WASO 909/121797; January 2014.
- 11 - According to park staff, 50% of the parks use is located in coastal wilderness. May 5, 2014 meeting with Olympic National Park staff.

12 - 16 U.S.C. 1131(a)

13 - 1938 "Statement of Controlling Development Policies", OLYM-621, page 3

14 - Keeping It Wild in the National Park Service: A User Guide to Integrating Wilderness Character into Park Planning, Management, and Monitoring, page 83. WASO 909/121797; January 2014.

15 - Olympic National Park, Final General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, March 2008, page 428.

Correspondence ID: 921 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Forks Timber Museum Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,16,2014 16:21:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

They address the issues brought forth by all sides

Comments: Naturally, we at the Timber Museum support an alternative that enhances tourism. We believe that D projects as closely as possible the needs of permitting future generations to access the park, but would include verbage clearly outlinging access - maintaining roads and trails for public use.

We encourage the use of our beautiful National Parks and only hope that the goal is to maintain what is currently included in the Park system - without adding to your ample acerage. Maintain what you have with the limited resources you are given - being fully aware that your resources are continually being cut.

Correspondence ID: 922 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Washington Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 16:51:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I have a handful of major concerns/comments on the plan options

1. I have concerns that you are trying to restrict access to the ONP - I don't believe this Park is under the kind of use pressure that make sense to try to limited access.

2. Please retain full stock access to the ONP wilderness. Not only is this a question of the public being able to access and recreate in the wilderness, it is also useful to ONP itself, and BCHW provides volunteer pack stock service to Park projects.

3. Also, please retain current mechanized tool use and Park Service mule strings used for trail maintenance. In BCHW you have a partner volunteer organization - but if you tie our hands by limiting pack stock access and the use of mechanized tools (OK< CHAIN SAWS, to be specific), you a hamstringing yourself and the requirement to keep trails open to ALL users.

4. Please retain access for commercial outfitters. There are many individuals whose only access to the wilderness area will be with the assistance of commercial packers. Also, again, commercial packers help YOU maintain the Park.

5. PLEASE do not implement advanced day use INTERNET registration permits for access. You are, again, limiting access to individuals who do not have internet access - yes, many people do have internet and ARE internet savvy, but NOT EVERYONE DOES OR IS. And how is your day-use individual, who just says, Hey, we're on the Peninsula, let's head to the Park, going to get a permit if they are simply driving around? Believe it or not, NOT EVERYONE has a "smart phone", or even WANTS to have one.

Topic Question 3:

Please see comments in #1 above.
thank you.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	923	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	924	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 925 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 926 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Kind of

Topic Question 2:
Keep it wild

Topic Question 3:
No Off road vehicles

Comments: Keep the Olympic Mountains a wild place.

Correspondence ID: 927 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No. There should be alternatives that are closer to "A", but with minor changes. B, C and D all involve fairly drastic changes is how the public is allowed to experience the Park.

Topic Question 2:
I think pack goats should be allowed on any trails that allow pack animals. There is no logical reason to exclude goats.

Topic Question 3:
It is unacceptable to require bear canisters for all backpacking. Many hikers like to go lightweight with small packs, and bear cans do not fit. There is nothing wrong with maintaining bear wires in locations that have them, and/or allowing campers to hang their food. Requiring bear cans for all backpacking is a ridiculous imposition that will

severely reduce many hikers' enjoyment of the back country. It is also unacceptable to require human waste removal bags for all backpacking. One gets the feeling from these 3 alternatives that ONP is trying to save money by drastically reducing trail and campsite maintenance and increase the payment of fees for use of the wilderness - and disguising it as "habitat improvement" and "enhancing the wilderness experience". I agree that the National parks are underfunded, but these proposals will all (except A) serve to drastically reduce the opportunities for the majority of visitors to experience the Park. I use the Park a lot, including the back country, and I do not feel that it is desirable to make it MORE of a wilderness experience than it is by removing bridges, privies, bear wires, etc.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 928 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 929 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I want Alternative B plan chosen as the plan implemented.

Topic Question 2:
Everything

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 930 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following

provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you! Let's keep the Olympics wild!

Correspondence ID:	931	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: The range of alternatives seems to be adequate.				

Topic Question 2:

The only alternative that seems to make sense is Alternate B, the "management approach."

First, This alternative prohibits the use of motorized equipment and transport except in emergency situations. As a former horsewoman who enjoyed trail riding, I can attest to the dangerous and disruptiveness of offroad vehicles. They are often driven by teenage boys or adults who possess little maturity and resent any limits on their riding enjoyment.

This alternative also prohibits the construction of new structures, which decrease the wilderness nature of this beautiful place. In addition, it allows natural processes to continue even where cultural artifacts may be effected. Finally, Alternative B also does not permit interpretative trails in the depth of the Wilderness and limits them to the "frontcountry."

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B can be improved to permit natural processes to proceed unobstructed.

Comments: Although I now live in California, I was fortunate to live in Western Washington for over five years, and had an opportunity to visit this wilderness. It is a truly unique rainforest still remaining as a testimony to the incredible richness discovered by Lewis and Clark, richness which has been disappearing at an increasing rate due to human activity and cattle grazing.

Whatever can be done to preserve this forest for future generations, which ultimately means keeping out many types of destructive human activity, needs to happen before such actions destroy this beautiful place, as it has so many others.

Correspondence ID:	932	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes				

Topic Question 2:

I like the wide range of options presented in the alternatives.

Topic Question 3:

Explained in comments-

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	933	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Friday, May 16, 2014				

Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Attn:Wilderness Stewardship Plan
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

I am writing in support of the Wilderness management approach described in Alternative B of the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan's Preliminary Draft Alternatives, including the following provisions and modifications:

* I strongly encourage the National Park Service to prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for use in emergencies. Please ensure that research activities and other administrative functions also adhere to these rules.

* Please prohibit new structures, installations, and developments, unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings, such as trail shelters and cabins, distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of the U.S. Forest Service and earlier National Park Service management in the Olympic Mountains.

* Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration, such as repairing trail or campsite damage, or removing unnecessary structures.

* Confine nature trails to the frontcountry; do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please do NOT add my name to your mailing list. I will learn about future developments on this issue from other sources.

Sincerely,
Christopher Lish
Olema, CA

Correspondence ID: 934 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

I like alternative A because I think Olympic National Park is doing a good job now of protecting the wilderness.

Of the remaining I prefer alternative D.

Topic Question 3:

I would like to see the self-registration stations remain in place. If this is not possible I would like to see internet or phone registration.

I don't think quota/use limits are necessary for the entire park and not at all for day use. I think the quota areas you have now are all that are required. Maybe in the future more will need to be added. I feel people should be encouraged to visit and use their park not limited.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 935 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: National Parks Conservation Association Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

yes

Topic Question 2:

Covers the range of reasonable alternatives for managing the Wilderness parts of the Park.

Comments: I grew up in Port Orchard Washington. I first visited/hiked/camped in the new Olympic Park at age 8 in 1946. The Park was at that time little used and very wild and natural. In the 1950s and 1960s, I hiked, camped and fished in the Park many times with great enjoyment. It was sad during these years (and later) to see what was left of the old growth forests in the National Forest surrounding the Park decimated as I also hiked, camped and fished here. When I periodically returned to Western Washington after moving to Michigan, I always visited Olympic National Park and continued to marvel at its beauty and pristine character. Based on these experiences and my knowledge of the Wilderness Act (I taught courses on environmental management and conservation for many years at Western Michigan University), I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. Prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

- c. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures. Where invasive species of plants and animals are a serious problem, please employ corrective measures that minimize collateral damage.
- e. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 936 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: 350CT Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

There are a sufficient range of alternatives but there should be no alternatives that allow for motor vehicle use and human modification of the natural environment.

Topic Question 2:

I like that alternative B offers a a somewhat better plan to preserve the wild quality of Olympic National Park.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to do the following:

1. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
2. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
3. Leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
4. Allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
5. Confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments: With development constantly encroaching on public and private wild places, it is important to preserve our National Parks as wild for not only human use but the habitat provided to wildlife. Parks like Olympic are most valuable in their pristine state and should not be modified for the comfort of tourists. People crave the wild forests to recharge and enjoy, please save this park for that purpose.

Correspondence ID: 937 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: (Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,16,2014 22:30:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

the Range is sufficient: from No change to drastic changes in human activities

Topic Question 2:

Alt. D. seems comparatively reasonable

Topic Question 3:

I do not believe the changes in Alts B and C for Human Waste Management are needed at this time and that they do not address some of the more visible current problems such as "toilet paper flowers" on comparatively "front

country" and even non-wilderness trails

Comments: Concerning draft Alternatives for Wilderness Stewardship:

In order of my priorities, I would prefer Wilderness D over A, over C, over B.

I realize the National Parks must balance human access to wilderness against the impact on the natural wilderness. I believe both alternatives B and C fail in this requirement by placing much more emphasis on reducing the human impact than in considering the long term benefit to the national psyche of adequate human access. Specifically, the requirement to use "blue bags" to pack out human waste and requiring structures such as bridges, footlogs & trails to have no net negative impact on the natural resources indicates no value to humans in such considerations. I believe the human activities most impacted will be those of backpackers and horsemen who generally are very conscious of the wilderness environment and strive to protect it by complying with existing regulations. Management strategies which do not at least allow replacement of existing facilities when they fail or reach the end of their safe life will reduce the numbers of backpackers and horsemen who get into the wilderness; that will reduce the number of citizens who will strongly support environmental issues, particularly on national lands. If we as a nation are to continue to support our National Parks, we must be able to see the treasures they protect. If changes in the future such as using blue bags for human waste above 3500 feet are needed to preserve existing resources, both the need for those changes and the expected benefit need to be completely and quantitatively explained to justify the reduction in comparatively benign activities.

I know some changes can be made to reduce the human impact on the wilderness within Olympic National Park but I believe management alternatives B and C would reduce public appreciation and support for the Park and its wilderness than reduce the human impact on the wilderness.

Richard Tipps

Correspondence ID:	938	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 22:37:05				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No, this is not a sufficient range of alternatives. Alternatives B, C and D impose too many unnecessary restrictions on visitor behavior which negatively impact the visitor's wilderness experience. In particular, I am referring to the blanket requirement that bear cans be used throughout the wilderness and that human waste bags be used in all areas above 3500 ft. Alternatives B, C and D also do not provide convenient registration methods. Thus, a visitor friendly Alternative E is needed. This alternative would only require bear cans where they are absolutely needed. This alternative would only require the use of human waste bags on glaciers or snowfields. This alternative would provide a number of registration options. This alternative would provide for online registration, in-person registration where a ranger would do the online registration for the visitor and self registration at less heavily used trailheads. In addition, the in-person registration centers should provide a self-service kiosk for online registrations when the registration center is closed. This visitor friendly alternative would also provide for full maintenance of the trail system and even allow for new trails to help disperse visitors.

Topic Question 3:

Yes. Bear cans should only be required where absolutely needed. Instead of requiring the visitor to carry a bear can, I think that bear cans should be provided at camp areas where they are needed. I suggest you do what they do in the Grand Canyon National Park. At Bright Angel Campground, at the bottom of the Grand Canyon, animal-proof boxes are provided at each campsite. Here's a picture of a Bright Angel Campground campsite including two animal-proof boxes and a pole for hanging backpacks:

https://www.flickr.com/photos/grand_canyon_nps/5942075542/in/set-72157627204606130

Human waste should only have to be carried off glaciers and snowfields.

A number of registration options should be provided: online registration, in-person registration where a ranger would do the online registration for the visitor and self registration at less heavily used trailheads. In addition, the in-person registration centers should provide a self-service kiosk for online registrations when the registration center is closed.

Comments: Requiring backpackers to carry bear cans would adversely impact the backpacker's wilderness experience and maybe make that experience impossible. A backpacker may need two bear cans to handle all the food for a week-long backpack trip. Two bear cans would make a load that would be too heavy and too cumbersome for many a backpacker. Older backpackers would just have to forgo the trip.

Only providing for in-person registration is a bad idea. It is very unfair for visitors from out of state. Online registration needs to be provided, so visitors can plan their trips before they travel to the park. A visitor might be only interested in doing a specific backpack trip. Requiring this person to travel from out of state to an in-person registration center to find out that no permits are available is not fair. This person should know his permit status before leaving town.

Correspondence ID:	939	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

Yes, there is a sufficient range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:

Alternatives B and C would both be an improvement over the current policy, however Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B is clearly the preferred alternative. However, it should be modified to make it clear that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control, and that in practically all situations, natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded.

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Draft Alternatives for the ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

The critical point is that this is indeed a Wilderness plan. As such, it must be guided by the management approach which meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act. In that respect, both Alternatives B and C would be an improvement over current policy. However, Alternative B is the only alternative most consistent with the provisions of the Wilderness Act.

As such, I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

1. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an undisturbed wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character.
2. strictly prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
3. As much as possible, allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
4. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, allow natural processes to prevail. This is critical to keeping the wilderness intact. Except for human safety or preventing ecological damage, natural processes in the wilderness should not be compromised or manipulated.
5. remove small pieces of marine debris without the use of helicopters or other motorized equipment. Large pieces should be removed by the minimum method appropriate to the task. The park should also continue to support and

engage volunteers during the annual coastal cleanup.

6. Do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness areas of the park.

7. Require the use of bear canisters throughout the park in order to create a uniform standard that is easy to follow. Remove bear wires, thus reducing potential damage to trees in the wilderness.

8. Reduce the number of trail miles open to stock use.

9. Limit aircraft use as much as possible and, if unavoidable, schedule it during times of lower visitor use, as much as feasible.

10. Strive to manage species across boundaries on a landscape scale as a response to effects of climate change.

11. Develop clear strategies for mitigation and removal of non-native species including, but not limited to, mountain goats and high mountain fish.

I appreciate the wide range of alternatives and the careful thought and deliberation that has gone into the development of this preliminary draft. Again, it is my opinion that Alternative B, with some modifications, best meets the intent of the Wilderness Act, which should be the overriding consideration in development of this plan for the Olympic Wilderness in ONP. Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID:	940	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Alternative B to protect Olympic Wilderness.				

Topic Question 2:

Protection of Wilderness. Specific protection of wildlife and wildness of Olympic National Park. It is important to limit development of the wilderness, airships, and limiting building more structures, noise and management which at times must be limiting development, protection of soil, wilderness, wildlife, and primitive wilderness visitors experience and solitudes and provide for future generations in primitive experiences.

Topic Question 3:

I would not favor the damage and development to the wildness of the park and the wilderness which needs to be protected at the highest standards. I promotes minimizes human controls. I proposes wilderness solitudes, primitive experiences and limiting human impacts which can changing humans and the National Park best these to lessen impacting the natural and wildlife and wilderness experiences.

Comments: I suggest protect Olympic National Park which includes the Wilderness Act in Park, deserved natural processes minimizing development and manipulating and development. Limiting other alternatives and damages which can impact recreation emphasize cause human development, and impacting natural processes.

In addition I have a Bachelors and Masters degree in Resource Management, Interpretation, Wildlife, Environmental Education, Conservation, Geology and Forestry including Park Experiences and management. Additionally George Wright Society and multiple organizations and professional. I have over 40 years of experience with National Park Service, US. Forest Service, Corps of Engineers, Urban and Wilderness Park Experiences protection of water, land, plants wild quality and park and education for visitors and park quality.

Look and plan carefully while planning the quality of uniqueness of wilderness and future experiences to Olympic National Park.

Correspondence ID: 941 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I do not think there needs to be a range of alternatives. I think there is only one choice that works.

Topic Question 2:

The only choice I like is B. It is the only choice that limits human impact, preserving the solitude and wilderness for the Olympic Wilderness. The natural processes should be left to run unimpeded by human interference. Wilderness cannot be true wilderness unless we take the human out of the picture and allow nature to take control itself, which it has been doing successfully for hundreds of years until humans interfered.

Topic Question 3:

There should be no motorized equipment or transportation allowed in the Wilderness areas. Noise pollution, air pollution and the presence of human materials should be absent. There should be no new structures including cabins or trail shelters. Nature trails such as they are, should be confined to the front country and no new trails should be built, and the natural process should be allowed to run its course.

Comments: Let's keep the Olympic National Wilderness what it should be - wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 942 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 943 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

They keep motorized transport out and limit human intervention.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 944 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 Well alternative B comes closest to really protecting the Olympia Wilderness

Topic Question 2:

I like B best because it allows the wilderness to be wilderness without the stresses of human interference.

Topic Question 3:

IDK

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 945 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
 yes

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 946 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 947 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Possibly.

Topic Question 2:

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Topic Question 3:

If the alternatives don't adequately address or include the key issues facing the Wilderness, then neither will the final plan.

Comments: 1. I Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 948 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:
Alternative B

Topic Question 3:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 949 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
The only acceptable alternative is "A". All others irrelevant

Topic Question 2:
Nothing except for "A"

Topic Question 3:
All elements should be eliminated except for "A"

Comments: I am in favor of maintaining the "status quo" and having the park service uphold the original park mandate, absolutely nothing else.

Correspondence ID: 950 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes. The alternatives cover a broad spectrum that will clearly place individuals and organizations into four "camps"

and assist decision makers in determining the popularity of each alternative.

Topic Question 2:

I favor Alternative A: No Action.

My observations over the last 50 years is Olympic National Park staff have done an outstanding job of managing the resource provided the minimal funding they have received to do the job. I truly believe the NPS will continue to attract individuals with the strong ethics and dedication to service I have observed over my lifetime. I am confident these individuals will continue to respond wisely to future needs and conditions associated with wilderness management.

Topic Question 3:

Alternative D is the compromise that is palatable.

Comments: Thank you for all the hard work that was put into this process and the opportunity to comment. No one knows the Olympic Wilderness better than ONP staff and the impacts/improvements that are occurring. My hope is that they are provided the funding and support from public/administration to continue to do the work efficiently.

Correspondence ID:	951	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

For my views yes provided that alternative B is amended sufficiently.

Topic Question 2:

A seems administratively easiest and listens to views that are undecided about the best course. C and D lose sight of the philosophy underlying 'wilderness' but do give those who do not have this mind set a chance to weigh in.

Topic Question 3:

I have read the suggestions outlined in the May 13 Guardian newsletter from Wilderness Watch and feel they address my concerns adequately. If unknown to you they are available this link: <guardian@wildernesswatch.org>.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	952	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 09:54:50				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No. I believe that the four alternatives do not fully address the stewardship of cultural resources and more Alternatives than just Alternative D needs to address their protection. An alteration of Alternative C to include more protection for cultural resources, found in Alternative D, could create another Alternative. (Please see Comments section for additional detail).

Topic Question 2:

I appreciate that Alternative D provides protection, public access and education about cultural resources within the park and more closely aligns with the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archeological Resources Protection Act and what I believe was the intent of the Wilderness Act. (Please see Comments section for additional detail).

Topic Question 3:

I feel that the treatment of cultural resources in Alternatives B, and C should be changed. They need to be revised in order to offer stewardship of both our national built and natural heritage. An equal concern for both can create one Wilderness Stewardship Plan that provides protection and opportunities for public engagement with both. (Please

see Comments section for additional detail).

Comments: 17 May 2014

ATTN: WSP Preliminary Draft Alternatives
Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan Draft Alternatives. My name is Erica Witcher and I am a student at the University of Washington working toward my Masters of Architecture degree with a Certificate in Historic Preservation. My undergraduate architecture degree, graduate research, work in the field of architecture and lifetime passion for playing and learning in the Olympic National Park have left me with a desire to comment on these Wilderness Stewardship Plan Draft Alternatives. I have written these comments with input from the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 created Wilderness Areas in the United States in order to preserve and protect the natural condition of remaining wild areas of the country. The Act stated that they "shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness" ("Wilderness Act" Section 2. (a)). It also states that these wilderness areas "may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, or historic value" ("Wilderness Act" Section 2. (c) (4)). The Act specifically recognizes the value of the wilderness' natural features as well as cultural resources within that wilderness.

It is the responsibility of the Olympic National Park to be stewards of the wilderness in order to provide the public with the opportunity to use and enjoy the wilderness, including its existing historic structures. The Act provides that "each agency administering any area designated as wilderness shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes for which it may have been established as also to preserve its wilderness character. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use ("Wilderness Act" Section 4. (b)).

It was not the intent of the Wilderness Act to return these Wilderness Areas to a pre-human state. To do so robs society the opportunity to understand the ways in which humans have altered the land over time, both positively and negatively. The physical evidence of our human interactions with nature, when they do not have a substantially negative ecological impact, enrich the public's wilderness experience.

It is with the goals of the Wilderness Act in mind that I assert that the only Alternative in the Olympic National Parks Wilderness Stewardship Plan Draft Alternatives, which achieves these goals, is Alternative D.

The absence of protection for historic buildings and other cultural resources in Alternatives A, B, and C leaves them insufficient in achieving the goals of the Wilderness Act, as well as other federal legislation such as the National Historic Preservation Act and the Archeological Resources Protection Act.

The following sections outline the issues and opportunities of Alternatives A, B, C and D in connection to cultural resource management.

Cultural Resource Protection:

From the Draft (Alternatives B and C):

"Cultural resources would remain largely undisturbed and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes would prevail."

This is problematic for historic, culturally significant structures that are currently, or could become, threatened by natural processes. Resources that are currently threatened include the 1930's era Enchanted Valley Chalet, which is in danger from the movement of the East Fork of the Quinault River. The chalet is within a foot or two of the river

and risks significant harm. The site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2007 and is an excellent example of a hewn-log lodge. It has been used for recreation and accommodation, as an Aircraft Service Warnings station, a seasonal ranger station, and as an emergency trail shelter, telling an incredible story about Olympic National Park's history and to lose it would be a serious loss to our cultural heritage.

Other properties are constantly susceptible to damage through natural processes, such as earthquakes, storms, landslides or rockslides, and the movement of rivers. Other National Register historic structures located close to the banks of rivers within the Olympic National Park include the Elk Lick Lodge, which sits close to the north bank of the Lost River, the 1935-built Altair Campground Community Kitchen on the southern bank of the Elwha River, the Fifteen Mile Shelter along the northwest bank of the North Fork Bogachiel River, Happy Four Shelter along the north bank of the Hoh River, Humes Ranch Cabin on the north bank of the Elwha River, the Hyak Shelter on the north bank of the North Fork Bogachiel River, as well as many others. Rivers naturally meander, creating an uncertain condition for some of these structures. Historic Fire Lookouts, such as the 1933 Dodger Point Fire Lookout within the ONP, are particularly vulnerable to natural processes, such as storms, because of their siting on high peaks.

From the Draft (Alternatives B and C):

"Cultural resources would continue to be managed in compliance with various federal and state laws and policies, including the Wilderness Act and the National Historic Preservation Act."

"A determination would be made as to which historic structures and cultural landscapes would be protected, while complying with applicable cultural resources law."

The process of making these determinations is not spelled-out in the Draft Plan however. The Draft presents that "most extant historic structures are either listed on or have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." The National Historic Preservation Act calls on agencies to consider all National Register of Historic Places-eligible resources and the Draft Plan does not mention this.

Alternative D asserts, "Cultural resources would be protected and maintained. Where there are conflicts with natural processes, cultural resources would be protected to the extent practical." This provides an opportunity for the Olympic National Park to protect and maintain cultural resources while being able to make judgment-calls about feasibility and necessity. It does not automatically mean the disruption of wilderness character. It also prevents the practice of 'document and destroy' for historic structures that are in a state of disrepair and the active removal of historic structures when they threaten natural resources, which could become the common practice if Alternatives B or C were used.

Protection of Historic Buildings:

Today "typically, major repair work occurs every twenty to thirty years. There is currently minimal routine maintenance conducted on historic structures within the wilderness area." This current situation creates a condition where more drastic measures must be taken to repair a structure, often involving mechanized equipment, rather than the more simple acts of building maintenance, which may be able to be done using non-mechanized equipment.

Alternatives B and C both do not offer protection of historic buildings that are threatened by natural processes, and Alternative B is more strict than Alternative C in its assertion that "all historic structures requiring reconstruction as defined by the Secretary's Standards would deteriorate naturally and non-native materials would be removed using non-motorized transport." It is because of this statement that I believe Alternative C is preferred to Alternative B in terms of its protection to historic structures.

Alternative D is the only Alternative that offers suitable protection to historic structures. It allows that "historic structures that are identified on the 2008 GMP List of Classified Structures could be reconstructed on-site and with native materials, on accordance with the Secretary's Standards." This wisely allows for the reconstruction of historic structures following standards that maintain the integrity of a structure and its ability to convey significance.

The Use of Mechanized Equipment in Historic Structure Repair and Maintenance:

The use of mechanized equipment in currently allowed (Alternative A) for maintenance and stewardship of historic resources that are listed on the 2008 GMP as important structure and are necessary for the operation of the park. The use of mechanized equipment is often critical to the rehabilitation of historic structures, and non-mechanized equipment can often simply not accomplish what is necessary to save, rehabilitate and restore many historic structures. Numerous historic structures would require mechanized equipment for their eventual rehabilitation because of remote locations, difficult terrain and other factors. Ideally, all repairs would be made using non-mechanized equipment if at all possible, and mechanized equipment would be used in a case of extreme need.

Alternatives B and C would remove the Park's authority to utilize mechanical equipment, such as helicopters, by stating that historic structures are subservient to natural processes. Both Alternatives pose similar threats to cultural resources. The determination of which historic structures should be maintained should not be based on whether the maintenance involves mechanized equipment or not, it should rather be based on maintenance needs, necessity for operation and on values such as those used to determine eligibility on such listings as the National Register of Historic Places. The Olympic National Park's existing 2008 GMP List of Classified structures is a far better establisher of criteria for maintenance.

Additionally, "low noise-producing tools and aircraft would be utilized where possible" in all action alternatives, minimizing the effects of mechanized machinery for repair of historic structures on natural soundscapes, whenever possible.

Alternative D states: "Park operations would continue to utilize non-mechanized equipment and transport to the extent practicable and allowable under Section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act." This would allow the park to make decisions about appropriate use of mechanized and non-mechanized equipment on a case-by-case basis, while still following the rules outlined in the Wilderness Act. Alternative D is therefor the preferable choice in terms of its allowance of mechanized equipment in relation to cultural resources.

Archeological Resources:

In the case of protection for archaeological resources, Alternative D is preferable. Alternative C is slightly more preferable to Alternative B because of its statement that "archeological resources would be protected and maintained according to pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values." Both B and C would allow natural deterioration, so they are not acceptable in protecting archeological resources.

Alternative D explains, "Archeological resources would be protected. Appropriate visitor use management strategies may be put in place where archeological resources are threatened. Visitor education and interpretation would be encouraged." This reinforces the values set forth in the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

The Archeological Resources Protection Act was created to recognize that archeological resources are an important part of our nations heritage, and their irreplaceable nature makes them necessary to preserve.

"Section 10 (c) was added [to the Archeological Resources Protection Act] requiring each Federal land manager to 'establish a program to increase public awareness of the significance of the archaeological resources located on public lands and Indian lands and the need to protect such resources.' The object of this addition was to reach visitors using public lands with a message that archeological resources are valuable to all, but must be properly investigated and cared for and that they are protected legally on public lands. Anecdotal evidence from Federal officials in field units indicates that such public education and outreach is effective and that casual or unknowing destruction and vandalism has been reduced substantially" (McManamon, Francis P. "The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979", 2000).

This aligns with the language set forth in Alternative D, and it is the only alternative that aligns with the Archeological Resources Protection Act.

Cultural Landscapes:

Four properties within the Olympic National Park have already been identified as cultural landscapes and are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. As previously mentioned, the eligibility of these sites alone recognizes their importance as signifiers of national heritage. Alternatives B and C both state, "no effort would be made to alter the natural process for the protection of the cultural landscape." According to the Cultural Landscape Foundation, cultural landscapes like these "reveal aspects of our country's origins and development as well as our evolving relationships with the natural world. They provide scenic, economic, ecological, social, recreational, and educational opportunities helping communities to better understand themselves" ("What Are Cultural Landscapes?" The Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2014). The lack of protection for cultural landscapes in both Alternatives B and C makes them inadmissible Alternatives.

Alternative D's protection and maintenance of these landscapes is critical. It is also the only Alternative to state that it "would implement recommendations from the Cultural Landscape Report for Humes and Rooses." Meaning that it takes into account the work previously done by the National Parks Service to understand and protect these cultural landscapes. Additionally, the statements that "visitor appreciation and understanding of the park's cultural landscapes would be accomplished through various methods" shows an understanding of the importance of using these cultural landscapes, and other cultural resources to educate and allow for enjoyment by the public.

Ethnographic Resources:

Because currently "there are numerous documented and undocumented ethnographic resources within the wilderness area" I am pleased to see that their protection are all addressed in every Alternative. Alternative B's statement that "staff would work with tribes to ensure that sites of traditional importance are preserved and protected" is practical, but it also states that "the collection of ethnographic resources would be encouraged to occur outside of the wilderness area," which would have detrimental effects.

Providing access to the group most closely tied to individual cultural resources is imperative, and retaining these resources in their original site is also critical. In the case of most ethnographic resources in the Olympic National Park, the Native American tribes who strongly identify with these resources need to have access to them in their natural landscape. Spirituality and narrative are strongly tied to both artifact and site and to remove artifacts from their origins strips them of much of their meaning.

Alternative C and D are quite similar in their treatment of ethnographic resources, but Alternative D adds, "Park managers would provide tribal access to ethnographic resources to the extent practicable by law and policy." These provisions of access are substantially important to the groups that associate with these ethnographic resources. In her 1997 book, Olympic National Park Ethnographic Overview and Assessment, published by the National Parks Service, Jacilee Wray explains how "it is essential to consider the spiritual connection tribal members have with the area...an appreciation of this relationship will be critical to effective park management where the peninsula tribes are concerned." Respecting this spiritual connection to the areas is a basic element to proper stewardship of the park.

Conclusions:

Alternative D is the only Alternative that addresses the stewardship of resources of historic value, clearly stated in the Wilderness Act to have not only a place, but an importance in the wilderness. Alternative D is the preferable Alternative.

Both Alternatives B and C set dangerous precedents for the treatment of our cultural resources nationwide, and both need to be altered to conform more closely to the Wilderness Act, the National Historic Preservation Act and the Archeological Resource Protection Act.

The need for more clarity in the proper stewardship of the Olympic National Parks Wilderness Areas is very necessary, and it is for this reason that I do not believe Alternative A would serve the needs of the park, the public and the wilderness as a whole.

I believe that a combination of the cultural resource values from Alternative D could harmonize well with the many of the values in Alternative C to create another Alternative. Alternative C places emphasis on the protection of natural resources, and the protection of historic built resources is not at odds with this goal. The two could combine to create an Alternative.

Many of the historic structures in the Olympic National Park are extremely popular with tourists, highlighting their importance to the public as individual artifacts and as crucial parts of the wilderness experience. These structures provide the public with yet another way to engage with and enjoy the wilderness. Historic buildings are also key to local economies and the continued, and even excelled, rehabilitation and maintenance of these structures would create jobs and attract even more visitors to communities of the Olympic Peninsula and the incredible resource that is the Olympic National Park.

Ultimately, we are charged with being stewards of both our national built and natural heritage and an equal concern for both can create one Wilderness Stewardship Plan that provides protection and opportunities for public engagement with both.

Sincerely,

Erica Witcher

Correspondence ID:	953	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 10:39:16				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	yes				

Topic Question 2:

well thought out with consideration of all aspects of the issues

Topic Question 3:

no

Comments: I favor the concept visions of Alternative D to reduce human impact and preserve the wilderness character of Olympic National Park.

Human beings NEED THE WILDERNESS EXPERIENCE. Therefore, they need to be educated on how to have this experience with consideration for the impact it will have on the environment. This means an emphasis on education at all levels of park visitation, using all methods listed, but especially face-to-face when acquiring permits.

Waste management and food storage are complex issues. Current bear cans are too heavy. Blue bags for human waste seem an extreme solution. Again, education could help. Also, alternative toilets i.e. composting could be considered.

In conclusion, an army of volunteers needs to be recruited to assist in revegetation projects, clean-up of trails and camping areas, and for trail maintenance.

Correspondence ID:	954	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Washington Trust for Historic Preservation Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,17,2014 11:19:35				

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We do not feel this is a sufficient range of alternatives. See "Comments" box

Topic Question 2:

We appreciate the need for a Wilderness Stewardship Plan. See "Comments" box

Topic Question 3:

Yes. See "Comments" box

Comments: May 17, 2014

Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Wilderness Stewardship Plan
Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: Wilderness Stewardship Plan

Dear Ms. Creachbaum;

The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP). Washington Trust is a statewide nonprofit organization dedicated to safeguarding the historic and cultural resources of Washington through advocacy, education, collaboration and stewardship. We respect the need for Olympic National Park (ONP) to develop a WSP as directed by ONP's 2008 General Management Plan (GMP), and provide the following comments and observations.

We have concern regarding a poster among the public documents on the NPS website for ONP's WSP that reads:

It has been determined that the only features within the Olympic Wilderness that will be addressed within the "Other Features of Value" quality of wilderness character are Native American resources (i.e., archeological resources, traditional cultural properties, and ethnographic resources.)

The Winter - 2013 scoping newsletter and the March - 2014 Preliminary Draft Newsletter state that the NPS has "defined a fifth quality, "Other Features" [of wilderness], which may include ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value," and uses cultural resources in the park as an example of a quality that, if lost, "degrades this quality of wilderness character."

We request that the plan make clear to the public that Cultural resources, whether Native American or European, are a valued and protected park resource as are the elk, bears, eagles, salmon, water, forests and air in all alternatives, including Alternative D of the DEIS. Our letter is based on current, known NPS policy.

Of the four alternatives offered, we are concerned that only Alternatives A and D provide a framework for a maintenance plan for the park's historical resources within wilderness. Alternatives B and C allow "natural processes" to prevail. Perpetually damp forest litter rotting a roof or average snow load collapsing a weakened structure are natural processes, but with a consistently implemented plan for maintenance of these structures, these events would not likely cause the demise of these resources. However, it is not likely they will survive neglect. We have reviewed the scoping comments and see no overwhelming public desire to remove protection of historical resources in Olympic Wilderness.

We feel Alternatives B and C are not feasible alternatives because of their inconsistency with the mission of the National Park Service, current NPS 2006 policy (NPS Policy) or the ONP General Management Plan, 2008 (GMP). As will be discussed later in this letter, NPS Policy clarifies intent to maintain structures in wilderness in its January, 2014 publication, Keeping It Wild in the National Park Service - a User Guide to Integrating Wilderness Character into Park Planning, Management, and Monitoring (User guide). Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation

Act assigns responsibility to agencies for developing their preservation plans, and gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to set standards for the preservation of cultural resources, which standards are found in the Secretary of the Interior Standards and are written in NPS guidance documents. The User guide draws from many laws and NPS standards and policies, as does the 2014 NPS publication, *Wilderness Stewardship Plan Handbook: Planning to Preserve Wilderness Character* (Handbook). The User guide and the Handbook are comprised of various sources, some of which are the Antiquities Act, the Organic Act of 1916, the Wilderness Act, the Redwood Act of 1978, NPS Policy, NPS Director's Order 12 and handbook, Director's Order and Reference Manual 41, and various other wilderness acts and other guidance such as the National Wilderness Steering Committee.

The Handbook discusses the concept of reasonable alternatives which "allows parks the park to eliminate from consideration those alternatives that could not be implemented if they were chosen, and those that did not resolve the need for the proposed action(s) or the stated purpose of the wilderness plan." (Handbook, Pg. 63) The scoping notice for the WSP identifies the purpose as "to guide the preservation, management, and use of the park's wilderness area as defined by the Wilderness Act of 1964. The overarching goal of the plan is to restore, protect, and enhance overall wilderness character of the Olympic Wilderness." The Wilderness Act of 1964 lists history as one of its values and that value reflected in NPS Management Policy (2006), the Olympic Wilderness FEIS of 1974, and the Olympic National Park General Management Plan (2008). It is a matter of course that the retention and maintenance of cultural resource be included with every Alternative in an EIS for ONP's Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

The GMP directed a Backcountry Historic Structures Report in 2008 (HSR), and is indicative of ONP's intent to comply with NPS policy regarding historical structures in wilderness. Director's Order #41 instructs that "Cultural resource specialists must fully participate in the development of a park's Wilderness Stewardship Plan" and that "Parties interested in the historic preservation issue(s) must be consulted, including but not limited to....State Historic Preservation officers, and, if necessary, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation" (DO 41 Â§6.12). We ask for clarification about SHPO's participation in the development of the alternatives.

The Olympics include tribal artifacts and their ancient trails, and the imprint of Euro-Americans who, before the park was established, explored the landscape and settled on the land. While the area was under the jurisdiction of the USDA-Forest Service, many trails and shelters were built by Forest Service staff and the CCC for management of the land, and recreational "chalets" were built for hikers and hunters. An ascent of Mt. Olympus and surrounding peaks was the choice for the first annual Outing by The Mountaineers club of Seattle in 1907, led by Asahel Curtis (The Mountaineer, Vol 1, No. 1, March, 1907). William and Grant Humes, local homesteaders, hosted the climbing party at a camp and gave the climbing party route information and regaled them with local lore. Other recreation clubs such as Klahhane Club and The Olympians explored the Olympics as well as many boy-scout troops in the Pacific Northwest, who earned their badges by backpacking in the Olympics. During World War II, trails and lookouts were built on the coast for a U. S. Army Aircraft Warning System (AWS) program and U.S. Coast Guard Northwest Sea Frontier Coastal Lookout System (HSR, 2008).

The Eastern Wilderness Areas Act of 1975 (Public Law 93-622) eliminated erroneous criteria that only "untouched" landscape qualifies for wilderness designation. It is not likely there are any wilderness areas in the entire country that do not have a human history, and Olympic Wilderness is no exception. Indeed, the features on ONP maps bear the names of people and tribal legends and culture. When Olympic Wilderness was established in 1988, Ahlstrom's Prairie and Roosevelt's Prairie were deemed the westernmost homesteads in the conterminous United States. Before Euro -Americans settled there, the land was modified by Tribal customs such as burning vegetation to promote forage for animals, and for plant-gathering (HSR 2008 and The Ozette Prairies of Olympic National Park: Their Former Indigenous Uses and Management. Final Report to Olympic National Park. Port Angeles, Washington. Winter 2009 - M. Kat Anderson, Ph.D., USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service).

Unlike bustling front country historical resources near roads, modern visitor centers and parking lots with the sights, lights, and sounds inherent there, historical resources in wilderness areas allow a person to see and experience the landscape as it was by those who were there before us, and to quietly think about them. Among the wonders of the park's back country is stepping into a landscape where before a pioneer eked out a hard living, or stumbling upon a bit of old puncheon trail or a shelter built decades ago, discovering a tangle of phone wire and insulator that once serviced a fire lookout - or a lookout itself, perhaps with a creaking catwalk, the frame of an Osborne fire-finder, or the remnants of a decades-old calendar. All these things against the grand backdrop of wilderness provide deep appreciation for heritage. This is why many back country travelers enjoy structures and artifacts in their original

setting, and this is why it is important to retain cultural resources in wilderness. NPS supports this sentiment in its Handbook when it states "The setting of cultural resources in a wilderness provides a connection to the place by the artifacts and relics that a visitor can 'discover,' provides insight into the history of the area, and enhances connection to past generations and ancestors." (Handbook, Pg.7)

Because the issue of preservation of historical structures in wilderness areas has been challenged in court time and again, we feel it prudent for ONP to not only clarify its intent to support its mission to maintain all types of cultural resources in wilderness, but also consult with SHPO under Â§106 and Â§110 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the development of final WSP alternatives. Historical resources in Olympic Wilderness and the people who value and enjoy them deserve a solid commitment from ONP that begins with the planning process.

The Wilderness Act states clearly that it does not trump other laws within the National Park System (16 U.S. C. 1131-1136 Â§4 (a) (3), and expressly names the Antiquities Act of 1906 as an example of other laws. The Antiquities Act charges government with the care of "historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures and other objects of historic or scientific interest" and directs that the "Secretaries of the Departments [Interior, Agriculture, and War] shall make and publish from time to time uniform rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act." Because the Wilderness Act does not trump other laws, then laws made in or prior to 1964, such as the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467) and those afterward, such as the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), are equal to the Wilderness Act.

The 1974 Olympic Wilderness EIS specifically states that "Existing and potential National Register properties will not be affected by the wilderness proposal" and that "Designation of wilderness will not result in changes in access or protection of potential Federal Register properties." (Pg. 95). When then Senator Dan Evans provided Congressional testimony for the Washington Wilderness Act in 1988, he expressed the intent regarding the fate of structures within the proposed wilderness boundary:

"... a concern was raised with the effect of wilderness designation on the [ONP] backcountry shelters. It would be my presumption that designation of the park as wilderness by this act should not, in and of itself be utilized as justification for removal of any of these structures from the park. Some of the structures may need to be removed for the purposes of environmental protection of the park. For others, repairs and stabilization may be warranted to insure the preservation of their historic integrity. Others may serve a substantial public purpose and should be retained for its [sic] benefits to public use."(134 Cong. Rec. S16522 (daily ed. October 18, 1988) (statement of Sen. Evans).

ONP's GMP states that "cultural resources that have been included in wilderness will be protected and maintained according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources and wilderness, using management methods that are consistent with preservation with wilderness character and values." (GMP, Introduction and summary, Pg. 52). We wish clarification whether the WSP affirms the level and extent of cultural resource protection found in the GMP, or if it reduces the number of resource inventory being fully protected, or if it diminishes the level of protection through selection, documentation, and neglect/removal.

The GMP states the park's purpose is "for the enjoyment of the people." (Pg. 8). While it is silent about history, among the basis upon which the NPS was created is to "conserve the scenery and natural and historic objects." The GMP also discusses historical structures as significant to the park, and that they are a value to visitors (Introduction and Summary, Pp. 11-12). ONP's website also includes a page with detailed information about Native American and Euro-American culture within the park. Clearly, human history is an integral part of ONP.

The General Authorities Act (1970) reaffirmed the Organic Act, and in 1978, the Redwood Act amended the Organic Act by reiterating that NPS units all be managed with consistency reflecting "high public value," and not "in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas (national parks) have been established." (16 USC 1a-1). ONP's 2008 General Management Plan lists human history as among those items of significance within Olympic National Park. "Olympic National Park protects important cultural resources with regional and national significance, including more than 650 archeological sites, hundreds of ethnographic sites, 31 cultural landscapes, and 16 historic districts. Within the park boundaries, 128 historic structures are on the List of Classified Structures" (P. 9). Because units within the NPS are directed to be managed consistently, and ONP has acknowledged cultural history as a significant value, we feel that all alternatives include affirmation of the GMP to adequately maintain them.

The Organic Act directs that resources be passed on to future generations "unimpaired," and charged NPS with that honor. NPS Policies 2006, §§1.4.5 and 1.4.7 underscores the NPS mission to manage parks so their resources and values are unimpaired. While we understand there may be circumstances whereby a specific resource might be negatively impacted, a wilderness policy that specifically chooses benign neglect as its plan will certainly result in impairment. Because Alternatives B and C in the DEIS for ONP's Wilderness Stewardship Plan will cause the impairment of historical resources and values, we feel they are not reasonable and request they be modified to include maintenance of historical structures and that Alternative D include clear affirmation of its intent to do the same.

Thus it is established NPS' mission to preserve human history, ONP's compliance documentation, and the significant value of human history in Olympic National Park and its wilderness area.

It is clear that NPS intends to manage cultural resources management in wilderness areas within its jurisdiction.

The NPS National Wilderness Steering Committee's Guidance "White" Paper dated November 30, 2002, addresses historic structures in wilderness areas, and provides a detailed question-and-answer discussion about historical resource preservation and wilderness. It begins by stating "National Park Service policies properly and accurately incorporate cultural resource stewardship requirements into the management standards for wilderness areas" and addresses the varied opinions and the debate about what wilderness is and what it is not: "The ongoing controversy and debate about how stewardship of cultural resources fits in Wilderness seems to stem mainly from personal values and selective interpretation of parts of the Wilderness Act and National Park Service policies."

The User guide provides clear guidance for the management of cultural resources in wilderness areas and reinforces that no law trumps another, even within the boundaries of a wilderness area. Following are key discussions in that document:

In some cases there is confusion and misunderstanding on the part of both wilderness and cultural resources staff. And in other cases there is a mis-perception that cultural resources management and preservation is incompatible with wilderness and its stewardship. (Pg. 184)

Perhaps the most common misunderstanding is that the Wilderness Act has priority over cultural resource laws. (Pg. 91)

In fact, no federal law has priority over another unless explicitly stated in congressional legislation and neither wilderness nor cultural resource laws state that they have a priority over the other. Therefore, all cultural resource laws apply to cultural resources in wilderness, just as the Wilderness Act also applies. (Pg. 91)

Regarding the 5th value of wilderness, the "Other features of value" listed in the Wilderness Act, the User guide says,

Wilderness preserves other tangible features that are of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. This quality is based on the last clause of section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act which states that a wilderness "may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value." This quality captures important elements of the wilderness that may not be covered in the other four qualities, such as cultural or paleontological resources. This quality is preserved or improved when these resources are preserved and their loss or impacts to such features degrade this quality of wilderness character (User guide Pg. 7 and Handbook Ppg. 7)

National Park Service Director's Order #41 and Reference Manual provides a framework for a consistent treatment of wilderness management throughout the Park system. The Order specifically addresses historic resources in wilderness areas

There has been prior human use in all areas now designated as wilderness, resulting in archeological sites, historic structures, cultural landscapes, and associated features, objects and traditional cultural properties located in many wilderness areas that contribute to our appreciation of wilderness. It is important to recognize that all laws intended to preserve our cultural heritage are applicable in wilderness and must be applied in concert with the Wilderness

Act. (Director's Order #41, Â§6.12)

We are not assuming cultural resource protection may be neglected for any selective interpretation of the Wilderness Act, but rather wish to convey that NPS acknowledges this possibility and therefore has developed wilderness policy regarding cultural resources to be included in its management plans.

Homesteading and recreation structures are located throughout the Olympic Wilderness Area and many of these are on or are eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. NPS Reference Manual 41 states "Historic properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places that have been included within wilderness will be protected and maintained according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources, using management methods that are consistent with preservation of wilderness character and values." (Â§: 6.3.8)

The Record of Decision for the GMP discusses the consideration and criteria it examined to determine the preferred alternative to guide management of the park, among those being how well they "protect park natural and cultural resources." (Pg. 18). The selected alternative "maintain(s) essential elements of the park and wilderness character" (Pg. 19) and "Preserve(s) important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage" (Pg. 20). It also states that the GMP will "Protect and maintain cultural resources that have been included in wilderness in accordance with the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources using management methods that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values." (Pg. 8) and finally, "No actions will be taken that will result in irreversible or irretrievable effects on historic structures. The park will continue to conduct appropriate cultural resource management in accordance with the Secretary's Standards and NPS policies." (Pg. 23)

The current DEIS for ONP's Wilderness Stewardship Plan is based on measurements for five wilderness values listed in the User guide - natural, untrammelled, opportunity for solitude or primitive and unconfined type of recreation, undeveloped, and other features of value - which, the documents states, when the fifth quality [historical value] is present, it "is of equal stature and importance to understanding wilderness character as all the other qualities" (Pg. 10) and that "This quality is preserved or improved when these resources are preserved and their loss or impacts to such features degrade this quality of wilderness character." (Pg. 7)

Acknowledging impacts to wilderness, even from legally allowed activities is not a determination about whether the activity is acceptable or not, so long as wilderness character is preserved and the project supports the park's foundation, values and significance.

White Paper #3 (2006) states that a project be consistent with a park's Wilderness Stewardship Plan or with the park's Minimum Requirements Decision Process. The Wilderness Act does not prohibit the use of modern tools - it allows them as a minimum requirement to maintain wilderness so long as wilderness "character" is retained. The User guide is the latest resource available for the retention of wilderness character for projects in wilderness.

Minimum analysis and exemptions are used on a regular basis for the maintenance of trails, bridges and other trail structures throughout the Olympic Wilderness. Bridges within the Wilderness include in-stream work and steel beams, and trails that include rock and wood check steps, puncheon, and rock placement. Recently, three miles of trail in wilderness at Ozette have recently been layered with imported gravel. We feel that the minimum analysis of historic structures be similarly applied. Short-term impact to wilderness by occasional motorized tools and transportation of materials may be a prudent choice in order to preserve the environment surrounding historic resources in the long term.

We urge the park to develop relationships with partner organizations for the maintenance of historic structures in wilderness. Utilizing volunteer organizations interested in traditional construction methods would be a safe choice, as well as a rewarding experience for volunteers, who, in turn will know what wilderness is.

â€

We urge the park to collaborate with local and nationwide volunteers to arrange work parties for the repair of structures in wilderness. If the NEPA and minimum activities analysis is properly administered, historical structures can remain in wilderness - on the land where they belong, to remind us of our heritage. To attain this goal, we request the following:

1. We request clarification whether the WSP affirms the level and extent of cultural resource protection found in the

GMP, or if it reduces the number of resource inventory being fully protected, or if it diminishes the level of protection through selection, documentation, and neglect/removal.

2. We request a discussion on the poster regarding the 5th value of wilderness be included in a prominent location in the FEIS

3. We request that Alternatives B and C be modified to include maintenance of historical structures and that Alternative D include clear affirmation of its intent to do the same.

4. We request a definition of the term "natural processes."

5. We request that historic structures in wilderness receive the same consideration in the minimum analysis process as does trails, bridges, and other structures.

6. We suggest the following be available so that a meaningful and complete public process under NEPA can take place:

- o Clarification regarding the poster about ONP's definition of the 5th value of wilderness
- o The 1974 Olympic Wilderness EIS
- o The Backcountry Historic Structures Report (2008)
- o The User guide, Keeping It Wild, published by NPS in 2014, should replace the older USDA publication on the NPS PEPC website

Sincerely,

Kim R. Brown

As consultant for Washington Trust for Historic Preservation

Correspondence ID:	955	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 11:59:52				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Sarah Creachbaum				

Superintendent
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

Thank you for providing this opportunity to review and comment on the proposed wilderness stewardship plan. As a former NPS employee, with 19 years at Olympic National Park, I recognize the need and effort that is required to develop a management documents for protecting these lands under the Wilderness Act. My time on the peninsula spans even longer, back to the 1960's and 1970's when I came to appreciate the wildness of the coastal beaches and the impact of human use on the backcountry experience. Given this experience and love for the coastal camping experience, I am concerned in the current alternatives as it they address coastal campfires.

The Coastal strip is one of the most family friendly areas for camping with children. I have camped and work on the coastal since the 1960's. During the 1970's working as an archeologist, I lived on this section of coastal strip year round. I know of many families who have taken succeeding generations there for camping experiences. Camping trips start with a three to four mile hike through the temperate rainforest and then along the beach to a campsite. It is wonderful place for children to explore and play. The beach is constantly changing place. The tide pools provide a peek into ocean life. Eagles, kingfishers, cormorants, blue herons, gulls and crows are going about their busy lives. Clouds and rain showers and then burst of sunlight come and go. Deer, coyotes, raccoons, skunks and an occasional bear move along the beach. Whales and seals are seen in the off shore waters and sea lions are heard barking out on

the offshore island.

As a former park staff member I heard any number of people not familiar with the coast connect camping and campfires with loss of trees along at Cape Alava. I don't believe that this is a fair assessment and I hope that it did not influence decision making.

The coast is a much different environment than alpine, where soil accumulation and plant growth are both slow. By contrast, the coast has a mild climate that supports a high degree of resilience and robustness in its vegetation despite a dynamic environment. The beach is a zone frequent disturbance caused by the ocean surf. Most days are above freezing, and the terrace along the coastal beaches is very inviting for camping.

Here as elsewhere along the coast, spruce grows right at the edge of the land. The trees grow quickly and vigorously here. The trees growing at the edge of the beach berm have only half their normal root structure. Winter storms eventually undercut the roots and trunk. Trees then become unstable and fall. This happens along the coast whether or not there are campsites. Camping is not resulting in the loss of these trees.

In my experience, there is always enough beach wood for fires without resorting to causing harm to living trees. Each storm and each high tide redistributes wood along the beach, resulting in substantial changes and new supplies day by day and year by year. Each wind also brings more wood off the ocean on to the beach. The past three years I have camped with my grandchildren in August in the Cape Alava area. We have always found sufficient wood for an evening campfire.

As to the potential for unacceptable impacts to archeological sites, it is not likely that continued campfires would create additional impacts. Given my long term professional familiarity with the structure of the sites and material contained in them, as well as my experience evaluating the effect of fire on cultural resources, there is no indication that continued campfire activity would result in the loss of any site information.

All ecosystems are different and thus have different sensitivity to different types of human disturbance. The application of successful alpine programs to non-alpine areas is not sound management. Although everyone is entitled to their personal views of the desired impact styles of camping, these preferences should not be made into policy at the expense of visitor experience without solid evidence of their necessity. If there is concern that the current rules aren't being followed, it seems more reasonable to focus efforts on education and patrol, rather than additional regulation.

Furthermore, there is reason to be concerned that the enactment of new regulations will not include the necessary follow-up evaluation to determine if any good has been achieved. The current Sand Point area ban is a case in point, it was asked for as part of campsite hardening program at Sand Point in 1995. It was to last less than two years. A clear warning sign should have been the fact that it was not clear what the ban was to actually achieve. Nevertheless, the ban was extended another 5 year period and the relative advantages and disadvantages were supposed to be revisited but have not been. There appears to have been no follow up as to determine if the ban was needed or successful.

Although the hike to the coast is not strenuous, it seems reasonable to assume that most visitors have invested the effort in the trip because they have come to enjoy the coastal environment, not damage it. Most people take care to clean their campsite when they leave. Others clean it when they arrive as well to make sure that the cold campfire ring is clean and in the best shape when they use it. It is true that occasional campers fall short of leaving a clean campsite or fire ring, and occasional campers also cut limbs from standing living trees. This is unfortunate and clearly in violation of park regulations. However, in my observation of the course of many years, this kind of activity is not resulting in the death or toppling of live trees. Either way, if people are breaking park rules, this is an opportunity for education and visitor contact, not proof of the need for greater restrictions.

The reality is that the great majority of campers along the coast leave their camp sites as undamaged and clean as when they found it. Poor behavior by the very few should not result in denying a full camping experience to the many. Campfires are not necessary for survival on the coast, but they are an undeniable part of what makes camping so magical and exciting, particularly for families. The campfire is the gathering spot in the evening, where you talk over the day's adventures, and in the morning, it is where you warm up while you wait for the mist to burn off and

where you make your plans for the day. In managing the coast in general and campfires specifically we need to take heed of the observation of Richard Louv in his well-reasoned and well-documented book *Last Child in the Woods*. He points to the need to encourage free range play and not discourage exploration through "multiplying park rules and well meaning (and usually unnecessary) environmental regulations" (pg31) To accomplish this we need a plan that educates and encourages the young camper, not one that narrows the range of potential experience, particularly when no clear benefit will result.

I believe that this plan should include and analyse an alternative that address the following:

1. That most all visitors have a good camping and campfire ethic and that the campfire experience is one for enhancing younger children's wilderness experience.
2. That stresses increased education of both visitor and Staff to insure a positive approach to campfires on the coast.
3. That reviews the Sand Point ban to determine and evaluate its purpose and effectiveness
4. That any additional ban would be a last resort to address demonstrated significant impacts and would be only for a limited time period unless it has a clear beneficial impact.
5. That takes into consideration that Cape Alava, Sand Point and many other prime camping areas along the coast have a history of up to 2000 years of human occupation and use. At this time these location are in a wilder state then they have been for several-thousand years.

I hope that the preferred alternative result in a family friendly alternative that allows the coastal environment to continue to thrive and provide a unparalleled camping experience for succeeding generations of coastal campers.

Sincerely yours

Paul Gleeson

Correspondence ID:	956	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 12:15:35				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No. There needs to be a better balance of trail maintenance, and more choices for permits need to be available. An important aspect of wilderness is unrestrained visitation of wilderness. Driving from Seattle on a Friday night in January in order to beat the tides for a coastal backpacking trip beginning early Saturday morning would not be possible if I'm restricted to in-person permitting or on-line permitting (which requires home internet and printer). In-person permitting takes away spontaneity and unrestricted enjoyment of wilderness.

Too many zone policies to try to keep track of creates confusion to the point to non-visitation. People from out of the area with no detailed plans will be left with only front-country experiences, and will not have the opportunity to enjoy backpacking the Olympic Wilderness. Of course some areas need to be permitted as they are currently. There is no compelling argument in the DEIS for a quota mandate in areas of the park that are not currently under a quota system.

Regarding historical structures - given the rich human history of the land within Olympic Wilderness, and the prominence of this history - from tribal to early exploration, homesteading, fire lookout history, US Forest Service history and the legacy of historical landscapes, trail shelters and ranger cabins, World War II lookouts, and homesteading - it would be egregious and a disservice to the public to ignore it, not maintain and preserve it, and to let it go by neglect. Alternatives B and C are not in alignment with the GMP or the NPS Policy and should be modified to include more appropriate maintenance. If the park intends to allow historical structures to fade away by neglect, the public needs a definitive statement to that effect. A more robust explanation of what "natural processes" means and how the loss of structures will affect the wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

I appreciate the need for a Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

Topic Question 3:

The poster about the fifth quality of wilderness meaning tribal qualities only needs to be explained, and that explanation needs to be prominent. To slip this poster in a list of documents most of the public will not see takes away a fair opportunity for meaningful public participation in park planning. Of course I am happy that tribal history and tribal rights will be preserved. I have enjoyed scanning the coast for shell middens, and enjoy other tribal artifacts. I saw no overwhelming demand by the public in the scoping comments in the WSP to warrant the neglect of Euro-American history. However, if the park intends to ignore Euro-American historical structures and landscape, the public and SHPO need to be involved. Anything less than a prominent discussion about this poster and what it means renders the decision to ignore Euro-American history as a fifth quality of wilderness to be arbitrary and capricious. If not within the fifth quality of wilderness, under which quality would NPS and ONP put Euro-American history under the Wilderness Act?

NPS has published a new document regarding wilderness character and is specific to NPS policy. That document should be uploaded to the website for a clearer understanding of wilderness and NPS policy.

The Backcountry Structures Report of 2008 should be available to the public so they have the opportunity to know about the history of the land, especially if there is a possibility of losing historical structures in wilderness.

Regarding trails - maintain them, and allow for new trails to be built. In the next 20 years, it is likely that some trails will close due to natural processes or over-use. This will require new trails to take their place. I suggest a "no net loss" of trail miles policy to be included in an alternative.

I support blue bags above treeline, but see no compelling reason to require them elsewhere.

Comments: It would be great to see ONP historical structures maintenance on the NPS VIP program on a regular basis. Local organizations have approached ONP in the relatively near past to maintain structures in wilderness, however nothing has come of it.

Several similar projects on USFS lands have taken place:

The Passport in Time program repaired Columbia Mountain Lookout on the Colville NF. Though not in wilderness, with reasonable exceptions, original techniques were used to repair this lookout, originally built in 1915.

Volunteers recently approached Wenatchee National Forest with the desire to haul new pit toilet supplies on their backs through rugged off-trail terrain to replace an old one. A new pit was dug and the structure assembled. 100% volunteer brawn.

The public does want to be involved.

I was also surprised when I read the recently-written ONP Narrative that it does not mention Euro-American history in the park. This is counter to other documents about the park - from the significant value of history in the GMP summary to the ONP website page detailing history, the Historical Structures Report - and even the picture of a homestead on the scoping documents for this Wilderness Stewardship Plan. The narrative should be re-written to include Euro-American history if the park intends to maintain it.

The comment about the narrative is not outside the scope of the WSP, as according to the Wilderness Stewardship Plan Handbook, a parks narrative is among the first steps in developing a WSP. As it is, the silence of Euro-American history in the Park narrative seems to support my statement above about the poster seeming arbitrary and capricious.

I love this Park and I sincerely appreciate all the hard work that park staff put into it on the ground and administratively. I have asked several questions of park staff regarding this WSP, and my phone calls were returned promptly.

However, I don't think this WSP addresses everything it should. I hope the FEIS includes clarification, details, appendices, and results of SHPO consultation.

Correspondence ID: 957 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,17,2014 12:20:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No, the range of alternatives in nearly every case vastly restricts usage. I want to protect the flora and fauna too, couldn't there have been a plan that spoke to those needs and mostly kept current access? It's sad that the best option is no changes.

Topic Question 2:

I like the idea of minimizing the human imprint. That seems most needed in the front country, not at the expense of backcountry access.

Topic Question 3:

I am encouraged to by the citizen scientist programs and volunteer programs which inspire active participation and more ownership ad accountability of our lands. It would seem in times of difficult budgetary limitations, these dollars would go further than any.

Please save our historic structures to include shelters and the Enchanted Valley Chalet.

Comments: To be clear at this time I am for Alternative A. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 958 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

They give a range of options to fit everyone's opinion about the topic and allows them to choose what they want done.

Topic Question 3:

No

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

Correspondence ID: 959 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

Topic Question 3:

Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control. Specifically, a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules. b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains. c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail. d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures. e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 960 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 13:50:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I couldn't find the actual alternatives to read them, so I can't comment on them specifically. But here is my general opinion: the current management of the park meets my needs as a wilderness backpacker, and as a user of front-country areas like Kalaloch and Hurricane ridge, and makes the environmentalist in me happy, for the most part. Please do not make any major changes in any direction. No new roads, but no abandoning current roads, for example. Please try to limit the mandatory use of bear cans, and keep up the system of bear wires for hanging food, or consider placing metal bear vaults permanently in major camping areas. Last year I backpacked from Whiskey bend to Ozette, 9 days, and the need to carry a bear canister would have made the trip impossible. Three pounds of dead weight for a canister, and no way could I get 9 day's worth of food into it anyway. One thing I would like to see: banning of generators at campgrounds like Kalaloch. The noise and the stench are totally out of character with a national park. There is electricity there already, putting in electricity for the sites, or some of them at least, charging more for those sites, then banning the generators, would go a long way toward restoring peace and quiet to the campground. Or just ban the generators. I see too many changes that are not improvements. Getting permits from the WIC has recently gotten more difficult and more complicated, for example. Anyway, keep up the good work. As for buildings like the Enchanted valley chalet, I kind of don't care. Sure, save it if feasible. If not, burn it in place or something.

Correspondence ID: 961 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	962	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	National Coast Trail Association Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,17,2014 14:41:09				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

While the range of alternatives appears overall to be sufficient, we offer the following observation for your consideration. The no-action alternative clearly required by law to set a base-line, the other three alternatives essentially either emphasize enhancing/restoring the environment/natural resources (B), protecting the environment/natural resources (c), and maintaining current recreational opportunities/visitor use (D). There appears to be an obvious trend with the current draft alternatives not only towards natural resource protection but also restoration and enhancement of wilderness areas, with alternative D essentially maintaining existing recreational opportunities and seeking to either maintain or reduce current levels of use. Our only comment in this regard is that is has been our experience that draft and final alternatives in National Park Service planning documents besides the no-action alternative typically offers alternatives with an emphasis on resource protection, one with an emphasis on visitor use, and one (which usually seems to become the "preferred" alternative) that balances resource protection and visitor use. Our point is, that your alternatives do not seem to offer an alternative that strongly emphasizes increasing and enhancing visitor use while still providing for resource protection as required in wilderness areas. In other words, draft alternative D appears more as the usual "balance of resource protection and visitor use" alternative that would usually seem to eventually becomes the preferred alternative that is implemented.

Topic Question 2:

We appreciate the fact that all alternatives and all zones accommodate recreation, and almost always provides for visitor access, use and travel in the form of either trails, associated travel pathways, etc., allow overnight camping at some level, and also the maintenance/potential development of for needed access, recreation-related structures and signage.

Topic Question 3:

Specific elements we would recommend changing and added for all alternatives are as follows:

Comment 1 . . . On-line Permitting ALWAYS an Option:

Relative to overnight use permits, the in-person only application process is unrealistically restrictive. Given the relative remoteness of Olympic National Park itself combined with a probable daily quota of recreational users, such overnight trips require extensive logistical planning, not only in terms of recreating in the field, but also in terms of transport to the park itself. People need to know that they have everything they need in terms of permits and overnight camping before they make such an investment of time and money to arrive at the park. Although they

could be required to pick up the already approved application in person, to actually apply in person the day you arrive would mean that people would essentially be taking an unacceptable chance to successfully get a permit. Many people would most likely not be willing to travel such a distance to the park to recreate if this were the requirement. Therefore, permitting should always be allowed on-line in every alternative being prepared, on a first-come, first-served basis, with a specific beginning date and time when people can first apply for permits. Parks Canada has just such a process and reservation system for guaranteeing your permit for a specific future date to hike their own version of Olympic National Park's Olympic Coastal Strip, which is Canada's Pacific Rim National Park's West Coast Trail.

Comment 2 . . . Waste Bags ONLY required when really Needed for Resource Protection:

In areas where the degradation of human waste can be realistically accommodated, then bags should not be used, that is, there is really no need to do so. However, that said, as part of the application process, people also need to be educated how to properly deal with human waste so that it can indeed be degraded effectively in terms of the processes of the natural environment that would allow it to degrade and not impact other people, wildlife, and the wilderness character of the habitat. Parks Canada at Pacific Rim National Park, for example, as part of being able to proceed along their West Coast Trail system realized that hikers burying human waste in the sand would simply not work, not degrade properly and so educated people to use what they had called the "tidal flush" method. Parks Canada actually has shown in their orientation video what to do on the trail before you were allowed to start your hike, which involved placing human waste on a rock or piece of wood and simply tossing it into the offshore waves, where it was mechanically and bacteriologically quickly broken down and degraded.

Comment 3 . . . Trail Maintenance for Safety Purposes as Added Criteria:

Maintenance of trails for resource protection makes complete sense in terms of preserving wilderness values. However, in coastal areas especially, where wind, rain and waves can significantly impact any existing trail, route, pathway, etc., not to allow some trail maintenance is clearly counter to also providing for recreational activities that realistically address any potential safety issue. Therefore, in any zone and for any alternative, human safety needs to be included as a criteria (along with resource protection) for providing trail maintenance, basic route information, and other structures, such as ladders, ropes, etc. For example, given the fact that people hike most if not all of the length of the Olympic Coastal Strip, at least from Shi Shi Beach to the north bank of the Hoh River at Oil City, as their recreational activity and goal, providing the necessary maintenance and structures is crucial.

Comment 4 . . . Trail Relocation/Construction as Added Criteria for Resource Protection OR to Address Safety Issues:

Any existing trail, route, etc. that would or has the potential to negatively impact natural or cultural resources should be relocated to mitigate any such impacts. What this could potentially mean is that new trail-building construction plus any needed associated structures, such as a bridge, would also need to be included in all alternatives and also potentially in all zones, at least in zones 1-5, the rationale being resource protection or any safety issues that would make such a trail relocation necessary.

Finally, thank you for this opportunity to provide our input and comments at this stage in the process of developing a Wilderness Stewardship Plan for Olympic National Park.

Respectfully, Al LePage, Executive Director, National Coast Trail Association

Comments: The National Coast Trail Association clearly understands, based on what is noted in the National Park Service information provided and quoted here, that . . . "the overarching goal of the (Wilderness Stewardship) plan (WSP) is to restore, protect, and enhance overall wilderness character of the Olympic Wilderness. Also, that "National Park Service policy directs wilderness stewardship plans to include 'desired future conditions, as well as establish indicators, standards, conditions, and thresholds beyond which management actions will be taken to reduce human impacts to wilderness resources."

Since " . . . the Wilderness Stewardship Plan will establish a vision for the Olympic Wilderness and guide long-term management and decision-making . . ." we realize the importance of providing our input at this key stage in the

process, and believe our comments are consistent with the expressed purpose and need of the plan.

Our organization's primary goal within Olympic National Park is to provide comments focusing on recreational travel for overnight hikers/backpackers traveling specific sections or potentially the entire length of the Olympic Coastal Strip. However, we believe that our comments could also be applied and adapted to other areas of the park where recreational opportunities exist towards protecting wilderness areas.

As a point of information, our organization considers the Olympic Coastal Strip as one major segment of our envisioned "Washington Coast Trail" trail system for hikers/backpackers stretching some 175 miles from Cape Flattery to the Columbia River, including both the Makah and Quinault tribal lands, to the north and south of Olympic National Park, and finally all the beaches further south to the Columbia River under the jurisdiction of Washington State Parks.

Correspondence ID:	963	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 14:44:31				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: NO, see Q 3.				

Topic Question 2:
No alternative is acceptable.

Topic Question 3:
YES, I would like to propose no reduction of horse use on any trail until there is a clear documented reason given for the reduction that isn't just a matter of insufficient maintenance funds.

Comments: I am a horse owner and trail rider that rides in the Puget Sound region.

I know trail maintenance is an issue for National Parks in general, as it is for all publicly owned lands. However, by banning stock use on certain trails now, it shuts the door on stock use in the future if funding improves.

Stock users are often well equipped with knowledge and equipment to maintain trails they use, so why restrict trail access to those who are willing to clear them as they go? Often in the Cascades now, trails are cleared by government crews only for the first three miles from the trail head, as far as many hikers may want to go. Horsemen or packers then clear the rest of the trail themselves. Many horsemen volunteer to help public lands agencies do trail maintenance, and I expect that is true in ONP. I would live with having to put up with poor maintenance now rather than close the trails to stock use.

ONP, because of its remoteness, provides a truly wonderful wilderness experience outside of Alaska. It would be terrible to restrict horsemen and professional packers from roaming this park in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Mary Shank

Correspondence ID:	964	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes there are enough alternatives				

Topic Question 2:

I support Alternative B which reflects the spirit of the Wilderness Act. Restoration should be by natural processes.

Topic Question 3:

Natural processes should be left unimpeded.

Comments: MY family and I had a marvelous vacation in the ONP and wish others to experience its natural and pristine beauty.

Correspondence ID:	965	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 15:14:18				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 3:				

I found the presentation of the alternatives to be a dizzying array of elements that proved to be difficult to compare. I was drawn principally to the choices in B and C. But repeatedly, the items in one category could not be compared to the alternatives because there were none.

The electronic format failed when viewing the maps, which were presented in a portrait view rather than a useful landscape view; thus it required a printed copy. Upon closer examination, too many trails were obscured in an overlay of colors and codes, leaving the viewer to guess at the planners' intent. For the next round of review, please consider revising the graphics of the maps to be more reader/user friendly.

Comments: Wilderness District: I heartily recommend adopting a management framework for OLYM that features a Wilderness District with a Ranger/Manager dedicated to its operation and oversight.

Trails: I support the continued maintenance of the core listing of all-purpose, foot and nature trails. I am opposed to maintaining way trails or trails that had been constructed and formerly maintained but have been long abandoned. And,those abandoned trails should be formally identified. Efforts to maintain or re-open those same listed trails should not be permitted or tolerated.

Carrying capacity: Establish separate overnight and day use quotas for areas that have historically been of very high use and popularity.

Established campsites: For those same quota areas continue to maintain established camps. For non-quota areas, dispersed recreation sites should be allowed.

Minimum tool: More walking, less flying. With regard to trail clearing, early season surveys of conditions by competent volunteers could be reviewed by maintenance staff. A management decision-tree could be applied to select the appropriate minimum tool, i.e, power saw vs. hand saw.

Structures: No more permanent installations for communications or surveys. Have a sunset clause attached to the permitting of any current or new structures. When no longer of use, remove and restore the site.

Historic structures: List those of significance that will be maintained. Document the others and either allow them to decay with nature's process or remove them and restore the site.

Drones: Ban the use of all droned aircraft be they intended for recreation, maintenance, fire monitoring, or research. Have a possible exception for SAR.

Fees: Not quite apropos to the Stewardship Plan, but try to keep our National Parks open and accessible by use of tax-payer funds and not user-based funding.

Thank you to the staff for the hard work done thus far.

Russ Dalton

Correspondence ID: 966 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
I think so.

Topic Question 2:

I like that in Alternative B meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, because it minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and still provides outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience).

For myself, solitude is one of the most valuable and hard to duplicate purposes that must be preserved.

Topic Question 3:

I think, if Alternative B is chosen, then in order to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: I have recently visited Sequoia National Park and have witnessed how careful management of our parks can actually repair and reverse damage that has been caused, through ignorance or lack of understanding of natural ecosystems.

I want whatever option is chosen will continue to keep the original goals of the Wilderness Act foremost in their vision.

Correspondence ID: 967 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:

I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

Yes, alternative B should be modified as previously described.

Comments: Over the years, I have backpacked twice in Olympic NP wilderness areas. Please manage the park to minimize human impact. Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	968	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 15:40:02				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: NO.				

Alternative that would allow replacement and addition to facilities to encourage more human visitors so that nature could be part more visitors lives.

Topic Question 2:

removal of non-native species, online registration component with education but still have backpacking permits at visitor centers

Topic Question 3:

human waste collection bags that were also compostable could only be implemented above 3,500 feet if the park also had collection areas for them at wilderness high altitude sites and then removed by park.

Comments:

Olympic National park has a wide network of trails that I have hiked. While the old bunkhouse and outbuildings of Humes Ranch are no longer present structures that were there before the park was created lends much to the experience of wilderness.

Human waste needs to be taken care of through the use of privies that are built far enough away from water sources and maintained. Bridges, foot logs and campsites maintained and replaced.

Dosewallips road repaired. There is less access to wilderness areas with Dosewallips road and upper Olympic Hot Springs road not in use with more impact on other areas. Boulder lake and Appleton pass used to be favorite day hikes off Olympic Hot springs road.

The restoration of the Pyramid Mountain trail, even though it is not in the wilderness, so that campers at Camp David and Fairholme, visitors at Lake Crescent Lodge and Log Cabin have a readily accessible trail that does not require a long car trip lessening the impact on wilderness trails.

Correspondence ID:	969	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 15:58:57				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No. Add an alternative that greatly improves the visitor experience. Vastly improving the condition of backcountry trails will go a long way toward improving the visitor experience at negligible cost to the wilderness.

Topic Question 2:

What's to like?

Topic Question 3:

What is the educational component in Alts B,C and D?

Human waste bags !?? Seems a bit of an overreach don't you think?

Comments: The National Park system was established by the 1916 Organic Act "to conserve the scenery and natural and historic objects and 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"

The Olympic National Park created by a June 29, 1938 Act of Congress "is set apart as a park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people"

The Wilderness Act of 1964 is "an act to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people" and "shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such a manner as will leave them unimpaired" [Section 2(a)]. "Wilderness areas shall be devoted to public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational conservation and historical use" [Section 4(b)].

The recurring theme in the documents just cited is that the National Parks have been created for the enjoyment of the people. This point has been missed in the formulation of the proposed Wilderness Stewardship Plan. Indeed, the proposed alternatives vary only by degree in how disagreeable and unwelcoming a future visit to the park may become.

The Olympic National Park is a popular park for local residents and visitors from all over the world. Those visitors make an important contribution to the local economy. Rather than trying to figure out ways to make a park visit as difficult and unpleasant as possible, park management should strive to improve the visitor experience. Providing well maintained trails and preserving historic structures is not inconsistent with the stated purposes of the Wilderness Act. To propose a management scheme that effectively denies park access to all but the most intrepid is an astonishing disservice to the American people.

Correspondence ID:	970	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 16:18:13				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I agree with the Wilderness Watch concerning the Olympic Nat'l Park "Alternative B" with one addition: I agree with one modification: Have toilets at trailheads.				

Correspondence ID:	971	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes, this is a sufficient range of alternatives.				

Topic Question 2:

I like the ones that minimize the impact humans have on the wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

we need to keep human activity in the wilderness to a minimum.

Comments: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 972 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 16:36:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes

Topic Question 2:
Covers ranges of vocalizations of past meetings.

Topic Question 3:
See attached document to ONP Superintendent.

Comments: P.O. Box 536
Forks, WA 98331

Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Attn: Wilderness Stewardship Plan
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

I have enjoyed many visits and camping trips in the ONP since 1943, a family horseback venture to Blue Glacier and many visits later. It is not Disneyland, it is my backyard. Proclaimed a National Monument for the preservation of the elk herds and subsequently declared a National Park for the purpose of: "...to conserve and render available to the people for recreational use, this outstanding mountainous country,..."

Visitor Enjoyment.

Therefore, beyond the interpretive display screens, campfire circles and precautionary trailhead billboards, it is essential to provide not only durable vehicle roads and comfort amenities, but extensive electric-wheel accessible trails and fishing piers to provide contact with attractions of nature. As we age, there will always remain some natural attractions unreachable by persons with decreasing physical capabilities, yet remain for youthful challenge.

Visitor use will increase.

Dispersed use areas are needed to reduce "entry gate" crowds gathering, uncertain of extent of preferred experiences. Season of use will be longer, as a means to reduce crowding, extending into inclement weather conditions.

Safety.

Shelters need to be restored for trail users, they are historical structures and have a purpose. Shelters were constructed for use by fire protection rangers, trail crews, and the public.

Facilities.

The mission of the park is not that of a convention center, school of higher education, nor carnival. These facilities and services should be exteriorly located and operated by private individuals.

Funding.

The recent sequester and defunding of normal operations is at risk of happening many times over. Shutting off public access to the ocean beaches and parking areas is in direct contravention of the purpose for which the park was established. (Refer to the quotation in the first paragraph of this letter)

At least, keep the restrooms open and functioning.

Many exterior access roads in the county were constructed for local rural landowners and maintained by taxes on private property. A method needs to be put in place to effect a cost-sharing with the park.

Land Acquisition.

What is shown, is that the existing National Parks, Monuments and similarly designated land areas are unaffordable. No further expansion of the Olympic National Park should take place.

Wild, Scenic and Recreational River, and Wilderness Designation.

Attaching labels to maps of such designations only regulate the Regulators. Managers of such areas are constrained from taking reasonable actions such as using effective (rather than minimum) tools to control wildfire, protect infrastructure, and wells, or move location of roads and structures threatened by erosion or flooding. Wild and Scenic river designation can, unacceptably, create de facto wilderness by requiring removal of bridges and decommissioning of roads which reach non-park lands.

Wildlife.

You create laws to manage people; ergo, you can create laws to manage wildlife. Do not even consider bringing in Canadian wolves. A Canadian riverbank looks like it was rototilled down to, and in the water, where wolves chased a herd of elk which were seeking instinctive refuge in deeper water and emptying their bladders.

Big game management can be discretely performed, by traditional methods and will put pressure on river-bottom elk populations.

Selecting an Alternative.

Only two options, A (maintain status quo) and D (meet the increased public use criteria) are viable.

It is time for a reasoned judgment, not yielding to pack mentality of those desiring only self-gratification.

Respectfully submitted,

John Richmond

Correspondence ID: 973 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,17,2014 16:48:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. Alternate A is okay. Give backs like the return of lost shelters and minimize or elimination of fees to use trails overnight are start of some examples.

Topic Question 2:

Status quo of Alternate A is fine. Alternates B,C & D are unnecessary and create unpatriotism. Majority of the ONP is already considered wilderness. Do not infringe on trails, all structures(consider all structures are important to our ONP heritage) and road accesss.

Topic Question 3:

Maintain trail clearing to all trails - primitive to high use trails. Use of mechanized machinery i.e. chainsaws must be used to keep all trails open all year long.

More funds to trail maintenance - Putting in footlogs where they have been absent and to upgrade those that are old. N.Fork sol duc trail has a footlog missing at one mile. Gorgeous trail but keeps most people away due to this handicap. Please read comments for more info

Comments: Too much beaucracy of enviromental studies (waste of tax payers money)to maintain trails that have been there for generations. I want to enjoy them like my parents did. That why they moved here from N.Y. to raise a family and use the ONP every weekend. I am a proud ONP volunteer of trail clearing.

No bear canisters needed in our ONP. Bear wires are great in heavily used trails. I have had no bear food encounters in my over night hiking experiences.

No blue bags are necessary for hiking trails and back country. Another waste of tax payer money. Okay to have for olympus glacier travel.

Maintain all structures in ONP & trails. Would like to see return of shelters that have been taken away over the years. All these structures are history to our park like parks in the East. They are destinations to these trails and add character to all who travel them. One must only hike one trail to see the importance our forefathers had in building these trails and structures. They are a gift to us and all generations. They worked hard to create a bounty of wilderness at our disposal by just walking. The Park has no value if it did not have trails and structures for us to use daily. I am disappointed with B,C & D alternatives and are loaded with an excess of takeaways. Unnecessary and a waste of taxpayer moneys. Simply put majority of ONP is wilderness already.

Please maintain & increase access to all trails, roads and structures.

Correspondence ID:	974	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 16:49:28				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

This is not a sufficient range because all alternatives include the expanded imposition of use quotas and bear canisters, and prohibit self-registration for overnight backcountry use. I understand that quotas are appropriate in some high-use areas where camping sites are limited, but does a problem truly exist that requires a park-wide policy here? I doubt it. Same for bear canisters - where is the park-wide problem that motivates this policy? I certainly haven't heard about it. How many backpackers are going to have their trip sullied by being hassled by a ranger for refusing to carry a bear canister? When I'm in the park, the last thing I really want is to have an unpleasant encounter with a ranger who is bent on enforcing some stupid new unnecessary rule. It's obviously not the ranger's fault, but please don't load them up with additional rules that create more problems than they solve. And what's the problem with self registration for back country use? Again, I can see the need in high-use areas at high-use times, but park-wide? I can't see the point other than providing the rangers an opportunity to lecture you on all the things you can't do. I doubt that many back country users really need that.

In addition, we need an alternative that leaves the door open for new trails or the restoration of previously abandoned ones. People can't appreciate the park if they can't access it, and making large areas off-limits to all but those willing & able to go off-trail, benefits very, very few.

Topic Question 2:

I would like the no-action alternative if the above-mentioned points were eliminated. Otherwise there is nothing I like about them.

Topic Question 3:

Please scrap the bear canister requirement, and maintain or expand self-registration. Additionally, it's mind-boggling that you would propose abandoning Griff Creek Trail. This is a popular trail that's convenient to Port Angeles residents, very handy for conditioning when getting in shape for alpine or other back country trips.

Comments: Any new imposition on users of the park needs to be an appropriate response to a well-defined PROBLEM that most users of the park agree is a problem. As it stands, the whole proposition appears to be designed by an elitist minority who are in love with the idea of a trackless wilderness devoid of human presence. In reality, the only effect the proposed trail reductions would have is to diminish enjoyment of the park by hindering, or effectively eliminating, access to those regions accessed by the trails in question. I've hiked many of these and so have been able to appreciate what's there; without the trails these places might as well not even exist. I've also spent a considerable amount of time hiking off-trail, and it's a simple fact that you could spend a lifetime doing that in the ONP with the existing trail system exactly as it is. Olympic National Park exists largely for the use and enjoyment of the people, but that's obviously not a guiding principle behind the current propositions.

Bottom line from my point of view: there's nothing to be gained by fewer trails and much to be lost. Go with the no-action alternative, or a new alternative that enhances access rather than hindering it.

Correspondence ID:	975	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	American Mountain Guides Association Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,17,2014 17:11:30				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: Yes. Please see comment letter below.				

Topic Question 2:

See comments below.

Topic Question 3:

See comments below.

Comments: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

The American Mountain Guides Association (AMGA) welcomes the opportunity to provide our thoughts on the Preliminary Alternatives for Olympic National Park's (OLYM) Wilderness Stewardship Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (WSP). We support the park in this process of creating a balanced plan that maintains wilderness character while still providing opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation to the public, both self-guided and guided.

About the AMGA

Our mission is to inspire and support a culture of American mountain craft.

The American Mountain Guides Association (AMGA) is a 501(c)(3) educational non-profit that is dedicated to supporting the American mountain guiding and climbing instructor community. As the leading organization of America's most vibrant, inspiring community of climbers and skiers, the AMGA offers cutting edge knowledge and hundreds of years of collective experience. AMGA guides and staff are the experts in the business of being a guide. We spent 30 years setting standards for American guiding instruction, protecting the guiding environment, and organizing a powerful, unified community of guides and clients. And we will spend the next 30 supporting guides as they pursue their passion.

Comments

In general terms, the Preliminary Alternatives sufficiently address the spectrum of paradigms for wilderness stewardship. The AMGA subscribes to the paradigm embraced by Alternative D, balancing resource protection and wilderness character with opportunities for public recreation. As with our scoping comments, we support the Determination of Extent Necessary (DEN) for commercial services in Wilderness, and utilizing that process to provide sufficient opportunities for the guided public to access the vertical wilderness. We would also like to comment on the viewpoints expressed in the other two action alternatives regarding commercial services.

Alternative C appears redundant, in managing CUAs to not cause resource damage. One would think that this was already an expectation. Regardless, we firmly support the idea of guides as educators for resource stewardship. In addition, it also appears to imply that the guided public is more directly responsible for resource damage, and needs to be managed more tightly than the self-guided public. Alternative B contains the more presumptuous assertion that members of the guided public are not self-reliant, and that only the mobility-impaired members of the public should be permitted to access the Wilderness with a guide. There are various reasons for hiring a guide that are accepted in NPS Wildernesses as realizing the recreational and educational public purposes, and the DEN process should be used to determine their appropriateness in OLYM. We hope that process would not be colored by such a bias, be it stated or implicit.

One additional point that we believe should be integrated into the park's commercial services strategy is the idea that guides should be professionally trained and vetted for the terrain on which they work. There are currently eight NPS units that have a CUA requirement for professional training or credentialing for mountain guiding or climbing instruction. We believe that this requirement provides a strong assurance to the public that guides are properly trained - a common assumption that is unfortunately not always the case, given the lack of national guidance on this issue. Given the variety of credentials available, we would be happy to educate and assist park staff in determining the type of training requirements that would be appropriate for OLYM.

We support the use of wilderness permits to manage public use, and using the time of issuance as an opportunity for education on LNT and park specific regulations and values. While we do not disagree with having park staff issue permits, we believe that educational resources could be integrated into electronic permit issuance systems, thus streamlining the system for regular users and conserving park resources from a staffing perspective.

With regards to quotas and use limits, we support adaptive strategies that are reasonable and provide minimal administrative oversight, thus preserving the unconfined aspect of recreation. Demonstrated resource impacts should be more tightly managed to preserve the natural character of wilderness, even if at the expense of unconfined recreation.

We support the CTAA human waste mitigation strategies, and strongly support the packing out of human waste whenever practical, and most assuredly on popular climbing routes, such as on Mount Olympus.

The AMGA thanks you for the opportunity to provide our comments on these Preliminary Alternatives. We offer ourselves as a resource to park staff for anything mountain guide-related. We thank you, and your staff, for the hard work you put into managing such an amazing piece of American wilderness. We hope that our comments are helpful in developing a draft plan. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions, or for more information.

Sincerely,

Scott Massey
Advocacy Director

Correspondence ID:	976	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 17:13:59				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No it is not. Another alternative should be presented that allows for expansion of basic facilities in the backcountry, such as pit toilets, bridges, signs and shelters, and to replace those which have been removed.

Topic Question 2:

Alternative A is the only one presented that is acceptable. The only element in the other plans that has merit is that of removal of non-native plants.

Topic Question 3:

Requiring "blue bags" in subalpine areas is not only unnecessary, but it is an undue burden on hikers, and is unenforceable. Adding this requirement is simply inviting non-compliance. Mountain climbers like myself understand the necessity of carrying out human waste on alpine areas and glaciers, such as Mount Olympus, where conditions leading to natural decomposition of waste are very different from lower elevations. But requiring this at lower elevations is, quite frankly, ridiculous. I have been to virtually every corner of Olympic National Park and have scaled many peaks, and have rarely seen any sign of human presence (i.e., fecal matter or toilet paper) outside of established camping areas. And in these areas, this should be managed by establishment and upkeep of privy toilets. The solution is more of these, not less. I also believe that requiring permitting for more areas for overnight stays is unnecessary, and serves only to place undue burden on people who are simply trying to enjoy the park. Attempting to close areas and corral people into a small number of permitted areas is also unnecessary and undesirable. It is completely unnecessary to go to these extremes to preserve the wilderness character of the park.

The idea that human activity within the park is incongruous with preservation of wilderness seems to be prevalent in alternatives B and C, to a slightly lesser extent in alternative D. It does not take much "reading between the lines" to see that this is what the authors have in mind. I reject this idea as extreme and radical.

Comments: I take exception to this statement from the Draft Alternatives Newsletter: "Preserving wilderness character is our mission, by law and policy". This may be ONE mission, but it is not the ONLY mission, of the Olympic National Park management. Excessive deference to the Wilderness Management Act has been a detriment to the operations of the Park Service not only at Olympic, but in other areas. This has resulted in actions that are designed to avoid lawsuits from extreme environmental organizations, rather than furthering the the overall health of the park and its facilities. Examples are removal of, or failure of upkeep of, shelters, pit toilets, and the inaction on preservation of the Enchanted Valley Chalet.

The Olympic National Park is already well known to frequent users like myself to be "hyper-managed" in many areas (Sol Duc is a prime example). Frankly, I find the entire thrust of this plan to be operating on the assumption that if the park rules and development plans (or lack thereof) are not updated to conform more tightly with the Wilderness Management Act, that the Park Service is being remiss in its duties. I reject this assumption. It would appear that Alternative A is only being presented because it is required by law, not because those drafting the plan have any faith in the possibility that the other plans are anything more than solutions in search of a problem. With the possible exception of the removal of non-native plants, there are no redeeming qualities to any of the plans other than alternative A.

Correspondence ID:	977	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
NO.					

Topic Question 2:

Nothing. But Alternate A is okay

Topic Question 3:

Yes, Increase access to park with increase trail maintenance, increase road access and maintain and restore all structures, i.e. on trails etc.

Enchanted Valley chalet is an example. Return structures that have not been replaced over the years.

Comments: Bear canisters are not needed. Maintain bear wires in heavy use area. Continue mechanized equipment

to clear trails. Chainsaws expedite trail clearing and allow increase use of trails which is needed to enjoy the trails. Blue bags are not needed in the ONP. Bags are okay for glacier travel like Mt. Olympus climbing. Most of the ONP is wilderness as one can see when they hike any of the trails. Important to maintain park road and trail access for all public to use and exercise for body and soul. Structures are important especially for historical and respite purposes. Whether a emergency camp shelter or a large lodge used years ago. No quotas needed for day use hikers on any trails. Wilderness plan and changes are not needed in the ONP at this time or the next generation. We must encourage more use of the ONP. ONP is a destination and a reason why I located to the peninsula with my spouse 60 years ago. There have been too many takeaways in the ONP. Please do not impose restrictions and decrease access to ONP for my grandchildren.

Correspondence ID: 978 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: RubyRuby Design Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: Member
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 979 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
1. Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-

specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 980 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 18:07:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The range is sufficient, but no single alternative is satisfactory as written. I think elements of each should be combined in the final plan.

Topic Question 2:

A: overarching concept of no major change. I feel the Park is doing a decent job of management at present. Prefer all alternatives as A, except those that could be refined through incorporation of sections from the other alternatives, specifically from:

B: aircraft use - limited to emergencies, scheduled during lower visitor use, etc.

B: scientific research

C: fire management - except I'd add from D that hazard fuel reduction could occur not only around historic properties, but also administrative structures.

C: ethnographic resources protected consistent with preservation of wilderness character and values.

C: stock use available at levels the park is able to maintain; however, I see no problem with considering goats as pack stock (D).

C: quotas and use limits, except would not limit for day use, and would allow 12 people in zones 4-6 with education and consideration of resource sensitivity of groups, i.e. volunteer trail crews, scouts.

C: campfire restrictions (with exceptions for those willing to carry in own fuel)

D: cultural and historic resource (including structures) and landscape protection to the extent practicable.

D: allow sport-fishing in lakes for non-native species.

D: increase ranger-led hikes (great opportunity for education, outreach and public relations).

Topic Question 3:

See answers to question 2 above for adjustments to specific alternatives.

Comments: My husband and I took our first hike in the park in 1976. Our most recent one was last weekend. We've logged hundreds (or more?) of backcountry miles -in easily-accessed areas and in remote locations, with children and without, day hikes, overnights, and one- or two-week backpacking excursions, ski and snowshoe trips. We've participated on volunteer trail crews, privy-construction crews, and performed citizen science. We've never packed with stock, but have met packers on trails, and without exception found them to be courteous and enjoyable company. We love the park and spend countless hours in all parts of it. As you consider the complicated process of protecting resources from being loved to death, please don't adopt alternatives that make the park less desirable to the average user.

One such policy would be the requirement of human waste bags in areas other than Mt. Olympus. I've hiked with elementary and middle-school aged scouts into the remote reaches of the park. Hygiene is hard-won at that age. I wouldn't encourage the potential health issues of waste bag handling, or a pack full of poop on the trip out. Also, if you've ever hiked on dog-friendly urban trails, you've likely seen waste bags waiting along the edge of the trail to be picked up on the way back. I'd hate to encounter people's bags trailside, or hidden beneath a log or vegetation. Please continue to provide privies, especially for the campgrounds that receive greater use. Allow cat holes in more remote areas.

Likewise with bear wires. We always hike with canisters. However, we've seen canisters that someone placed 200 feet from their own tent, but only 10 feet from the next (soon-to-be-occupied) camp area. Please continue to provide

bear wires in well-used camping areas.

Historic structures / cultural resources - keep existing ones and maintain them to the extent possible. Save such structures as the Enchanted Valley chalet. Keep human constructions like the Mountaineer's cabin foundation at Heather Park. These basic structures have practical and esthetic benefits in the backcountry. They are unobtrusive, could serve as emergency shelters, and provide a small anchor of organization against which the wilderness appears more wild. Also leave alone the ancient fruit trees that accompany some of the constructions.

Keep the ski area.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the various elements of park use. I want to mention that I had a major difficulty in answering because of the imprecision of the language describing the action items. There are many "coulds" and "mays" in the language that made the realities of an alternative hard to predict. Please continue to develop the plan in a public manner, with more opportunities for comment, and transparency about what that language will really mean in implementation.

Correspondence ID: 981 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
NO. Alternate A is okay.

Topic Question 2:
Nothing

Topic Question 3:
Most of the ONP is wilderness. Created more wilderness means less access for the taxpayer. The tech age has created less physical activity and the wilderness plans create less access which encourages less physical activity. We are going the the wrong direction with wilderness drafts and and need to create increase access drafts to promote physical activity to the tax payers.

Comments: Increase trail maintenance and continue to incorporate mechanized equipment for trail clearing.
Keep all trails open - high use trails to primitive trails.
Upgrade foot logs and bridges to keep trails safe and passable.
Bear canisters not needed. Maintain current practice with high bear wires.
Blue bags not needed in park except for glacier travel.
Keep & maintain all structures historical to primitive. i.e., emergency shelters. Return lost & demolished structures along trails.
We need to celebrate our ONP and give the overall park a renewed vigor and pride with healthy trail maintenance, care to all structures, complete year round access of roads, ie. hurricane ridge road. Open Deer Park road early summer season or late spring. Rebuild Dosewallips road.

Correspondence ID: 982 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 18:29:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, I think so.

Topic Question 2:

I support the elements that are common to all alternatives and to all action alternatives, especially those for Wildlife Management: Non-native species; and Reintroduction of Native Species. In the same vein, I support elements common to all alternatives regarding vegetation management of native species and removal of non-native species.

Many years ago, in the 1970's or early 1980's, I wrote a letter to the then-Superintendent of Olympic National Park (ONP) saying that the mountain goats, a non-native species, should be eradicated because they endanger and destroy some of the endemic plant species of these mountains. ONP took no action, and now over 30 years later, the mountain goats are still here. It is my hope that this Wilderness Stewardship Plan will address the problem at long last by completing and implementing the Mountain Goat Management Plan. Even though I see the two plans are separate from each other, they surely address the same basic need - -- protection of the wilderness areas of ONP.

Topic Question 3:

An often-quoted passage of the Wilderness Act of 1964 is this: "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

As the National Park Service defines Wilderness Character, the first four qualities are clearly consistent with the statement above. But the fifth quality, "Other Features of Value," is inconsistent when it is used to justify preservation and restoration of manmade structures within Olympic National Park, forever and ever. Just as natural processes change forests, rivers, and even mountains over time; so also do they change historic and human cultural elements. A wilderness river should not be messed with to preserve a man-made structure.

Comments: In the most general sense, Alternative C, with an emphasis on protection of natural resources, seems like the best path forward for Wilderness Stewardship in ONP. I look forward to participation in the next stage of planning, in which Alternative C can be enhanced and refined.

I support reintroduction of extirpated species such as the fisher and - - I hope - - the gray wolf.

I support vigorous efforts to reduce overflights of the ONP wilderness. Some of the most egregious of these are contracted out by ONP itself. I do not believe that low-flying helicopters are justified for elk monitoring and redd counting. Commercial flights out of Sea-Tac airport should not be flying so low over ONP. Nor should the military jets of the US Armed Forces.

Even though I am very familiar with the trail system in ONP, the zoning maps were difficult for me to follow in detail. In the next level of discussions, please label the maps more distinctly.

I have been hiking and backpacking in Olympic National Park for 34 years. During that time I have observed less and less funding for trail maintenance and a corresponding deterioration of the trail system. I believe it is imperative for the implementation of this Wilderness Stewardship Plan that existing trails be properly maintained. This means more trail crews should be hired. ONP does not need more trails, just better maintenance of existing ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID:	983	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

There needs to be an alternative that focuses more improving recreation and access.

Topic Question 2:

The only current alternative I approve of is the no-action alternative. I don't approve of most of the proposed changes to the current plan.

Topic Question 3:

There are a number of elements I would like to see changed:

1. No trails should be abandoned, and trail maintenance should be increased. If possible I would like to see previously abandoned trails rebuilt.
2. All historic structures should be maintained and restored. I would also like to see historic structures that have been demolished rebuilt.
3. I don't think bear canisters should be required
4. Please do not require visitors to carry out human waste
5. Please only have quotas in high-use areas and do not put limits on day use.

Comments: I would like to see wolves reintroduced to the park.

Correspondence ID:	984	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	No				

Topic Question 2:

Alternate A is fine for status quo. Dislike B,C & D

Topic Question 3:

Must maintain or increase access in ONP.

Comments: Enjoyed ONP all my life 55 years.

Please maintain and restore all trails primitive to high use.

Continue trail maintenance with mechanized equipment. Please continue chainsaw use.

Fix foot logs and bridges for safe passages. Return missing foot logs promptly

Maintain and restore all structures historical to emergency shelters. I would like to see return of shelters that have disappeared from trails over the years. These structures are important to the history of the park. They all have destination qualities.

Increase access to trails with road access. Rebuild and fix these roads.

Blue bags are not needed except for glacier travel.

Increase outhouse buildings in high use trail camp areas.

Bear canisters are not needed. I have not had any bear/food encounters for overnight stays.

Eliminate fees for trail camping etc. And no quotas for day hiking.

We must encourage physical activity and get out and use the park.

Correspondence ID:	985	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 986 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 19:11:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

They have broad scope and address the main issues. I favor Alternative "D". I appreciate all the time, thought, and effort that ONP personnel have put into presenting these alternatives. Not an easy task.

Topic Question 3:

In my opinion it is premature to require bear cans and human waste bags in the remote backcountry, such as the Bailey Range. So far, Ursacks and/or appropriately hanging food should be sufficient in remote areas as well as diligence in disposing of human waste (cat holes). Used toilet paper can be carried out.

Comments: Historically, Theodore Roosevelt and then Franklin D. Roosevelt, respectively, established Olympic National Monument in 1909 and Olympic National Park in 1938 in order to preserve this ecosystem for future generations to enjoy. We need to continue this stewardship even more so today and to preserve ONP for the future. However, as the world becomes more complex, we need to have a plan allowing more exposure to the wilderness, not less. This will be a challenging management issue.

With regard to the ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan, I have read and reread the complete 1) "Preliminary Draft Alternative Management Strategies" , 2) "Draft Management Zones", and 3) "Preliminary Draft Alternatives Newsletter". All March 2014. I also attended the public meeting in Port Angeles.

I favor Alternative "D" as I think it has the best balance for the ONP ecosystem and humans.

Scientific studies of the ONP ecosystem need to continue.

In heavy use areas, I agree with having quota systems for overnight camping. At this point I don't agree quota systems for day use, particularly on the trails. Is a day-use quota system meant for such as East Beach on Lake Crescent?

The current trails should be maintained and not slowly abandoned. This includes bridges, which are important not only for travel but also for safety. With an extensive trail system human impact will be more widely distributed throughout ONP and there will less off-trail travel with its negative impact. For example, the Appleton Pass

trail from the Boulder Creek trailhead should be re-opened once the dam removal project has been completed.

The trail crew needs to have the option of using power equipment in the backcountry when necessary.

Part of ONP's responsibility is to educate people about the wilderness and how to minimize human impact. This is particularly important for overnight campers who should be required to attend a "Leave No Trace" session. Do not minimize the educational programs.

An emergency medical system always needs to be in place. The option of helicopter evacuation anywhere in ONP should be part of any stewardship plan.

Permits for either day or overnight use should be available both in person (ex: WIC) or online. Also self-registration at trailheads should be available for day use.

In high-use areas human waste management, in particular, is a very significant issue and should have the necessary budgetary resources.

Bear cans are a must in the high-use camping areas, but not in the remote areas, as I mentioned previously. Personally, I have never had a problem with bears getting into my food in remote areas.

As a hiker and camper in Olympic National Park since the early 1950s, I have been overall pleased with how well the Park has been managed. For example, Grand Valley looks almost the same today as it did when I first camped at Moose Lake in 1951. With continued astute management, I hope the same will be true throughout the Park for future generations.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft alternatives of the ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan. You have a tremendous responsibility for the well-fare of future generations and ONP.

Sam Baker

Correspondence ID:	987	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
	No				

Topic Question 2:
Nothing. Alternate A is fine for status quo

Topic Question 3:
Increase access with the trails and roads. Maintain and restore structures.

Comments: Continue status quo at the minimum. Increase access is important to increase physical activity and enjoyment of our ONP (wilderness) resource. It adds value to all.
Would like to see increase access in the Park with trail clearing using mechanized equipment(chainsaws).
Restoration and upgrading of footlogs and bridges. Please return footlog at N.Fork SolDuc one mile crossing as an example.
Bear wires are sufficient for food storage. Bear canisters are not needed.
Blue bags are not needed for alpine travel or trail hiking. OK for glacier travel. Build more outhouses on high traveled trail camp areas. Lewis meadow as an example.

Maintain all structures. Return lost shelters. Our ONP history is as important as all other US parks and structures tell a story as well as create a destination.
Quotas on day hiking are not needed.
Increase road access. Example:Rebuild Dosewallips Road.

Correspondence ID: 988 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We do not believe this is a sufficient range of options as they all restrict, in one way or another, access for the public to the (tax dollar supported) Park. We have enjoyed Olympic National Park for over 50 years and remember when it was the only family vacation that was affordable to us.

Topic Question 2:

This appears to be a way to 'route' comments in a direction that further restricts access to the park and we would prefer to see infrastructure maintained or improved in order to allow more people to experience/appreciate OUR National Parks.

Topic Question 3:

Do not further restrict access to the park in any way. Maintain/improve infrastructure (ie access roads, trails, bridges, shelters) so as to allow access to our most precious resource.

Comments: Please consider the generation of children who should have the same access to lands funded by taxpayers that we had as children.

Correspondence ID: 989 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I fully support Alternative B, with the following suggestions under Question 3.

Topic Question 3:

1. Ban motorized equipment and transport, such as helicopters, except in emergency situations. Make sure that research activities and other administrative functions obey these rules.
2. Prohibit new structures, installations and developments except those that are critical to protecting the wilderness. Buildings like trail shelters and cabins distract from the wilderness experience.
3. Permit natural processes to occur undisturbed. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
4. Limit nature trails to the front country, and keep the Wilderness free of highly developed or interpretive trails.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 990 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes, but Alternative B seems the most thoughtful and reasonable

Topic Question 2:
Appreciate the thought given to them.

Topic Question 3:
Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments: Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 991 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
No this does not provide range of alternatives.

Topic Question 2:
Alternate A is good, the park provides an interaction with the environment found no where else in the state. I agrees that environmental education should be increased, but not at the reduction or daily trail quotas. While the OPAs language appears to be supporting the environment and the Olympic National Park as a teacher it is an interaction with nature that actually helps students learn about and respect the environment. Instead of reducing the ability for future generations to access the park it should be increased.
I recognize that increasing trails and trail access with be a financial burden, but you will have future generations willing to do so if they have access to the parks now. Increase ability for everyone to access the parks and increase education. Of the alternatives the increased education is what I appreciate the most.

Topic Question 3:
Increase access to ONP, we have a gem in our backyard, a place where moss grows by the foot and mountains meet the sound. Increasing access and education is what will help the environment,

Increase outhouses, and emergency shelters. If you compare the care for the environment in Europe and the care for the environment in the United States, it is not connected to a reduction in environmental access but an increase in access to trails and the environment that allow for care in the future generations of Europeans for the land they live in.

Do not put quotas on day use trails, yes the park is being "used" but the national parks were meant for two purposes, to preserve the environment and to provide educational experiences to future generations. The OPA appears to be a

group which is not limited by when and where they can participate and explore the national park. Those who would be limited by the use of the park would be increasingly hampered by restrictive quotas on trails. The restrictions and quotas should not happen. As a young professional I do not always get the choices to attend the park in the middle of the week. Quotas on trails would limit my ability to participate and enjoy and learn from the park and I should be able to.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	992	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 20:02:37				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, I believe Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Comments:

Correspondence ID:	993	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

YES. However, Alternative B is the only option. See below

Topic Question 2:

Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Topic Question 3:

My husband and I support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammelled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 994 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
probably

Topic Question 2:
that there's an option to limit human physical imprint on the wilderness

Topic Question 3:
the limiting of human physical imprint should be severe to protect the natural wilderness. No roads built going through it, camping/hiking activities be limited to the outer perimeter only (and even that be done in a minimal impacting way), and let nature take it's course in the interior of the wilderness will no human intervention. No vehicles or helicopters except for hiker emergency rescue or trail upkeep along the perimeter camping/hiking area only. Let this place remain unspoiled and intact please.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 995 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of Washington Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,17,2014 21:14:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, Peninsula Chapter (BCHW-PC) has 76 members living in Clallam County who contributed 3200 volunteer hours last year to the maintenance of National Park, National Forest, state and county trails. We also conduct Leave-No-Trace training programs throughout the year for both our members and for the public, provide both crosscut and chain saw certification, opportunities for emergency first aid and veterinary care training to our members, participate in search and rescue and emergency evacuation operations, and participate in and support trail maintenance and trail bridge construction projects conducted by several other volunteer groups and by Park crews.

Olympic National Park was founded as a "wilderness park... a trail park" and envisioned perhaps a thousand miles of trails in its founding management plan, the 1938 "Statement of Controlling Development Policies". Instead, these trails were never built, well over two hundred miles of trail have been abandoned, and roughly half the original stock trail mileage has been downgraded from all-purpose to foot travel only. All the action alternatives offered in this preliminary draft Wilderness Stewardship Plan would further reduce the maintained mileage of both all-purpose stock trails and foot trails.

Draft Alternatives.

Alternative B eliminates stock access on several trails which have been maintained by BCHW-PC volunteer work parties for years, including Happy Lake Ridge and Lillian River trails. Our members have also assisted in the maintenance of Wolf Creek, Aurora Ridge, Queets, North Fork Sol Duc, Cedar Lake, and Barnes Creek trails, which would now be closed to stock access. We are shocked that Park managers would even propose closing trails to stock which stock users have been maintaining for the Park for years.

In alternative B, "Some trails would be shifted to lower classifications with fewer facilities to construct and maintain" and "No new bridges, footlogs, or water crossings would be installed." Instead, "Efforts would be made to increase education and awareness about safe methods for water crossings." If stock access is lost, this would be necessary because maintenance and replacement of bridges and footlogs requires hundreds of pounds of gear be

packed to the work site using pack stock (or helicopter flights). We believe Alternative B is simply and clearly not in the public interest.

Alternative C is even worse, eliminating stock access on all the above trails, plus the main fork Dosewallips, Hayden Pass, Sol Duc and High Divide trails. It also eliminates stock access to the Olympic Hot Springs and Boulder Lake trails, which BCHW-PC volunteers have been maintaining for the Park for years, and to Mount Angeles - Heather Park trail which we have assisted in maintaining.

We agree with the stated emphasis of Alternative C, natural resources. However, we do not see how this alternative actually has any positive impact on the Park's natural resources. We'd like to point out that the largest pack stock operation in the Park last year in which our members participated was organized for Olympic National Park's own Natural Resources Division fisheries biologists and hydrologist to study fish populations in the upper Queets River. The Park now proposes to eliminate stock access on this trail under both Alternatives B and C. We do not see how eliminating the field operations of its own Natural Resources Division enhances the Park's natural resources. We do not believe that the transient presence of a few dozen stock have any significant impact on the natural resources of a Park which is year-round home to more than 8,000 migratory elk plus a similar number of deer and more than a thousand mountain goats. Under all alternatives, more than 99.9% of the Park remains in Zone 6 trail-less Primeval Wilderness.

Alternative D proposes to "provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences" by downgrading maintenance on a long list of Park trails (most of which, we note, were built by and for stock use, but have not been maintained to stock standards for many years) and ending stock use on the Cedar Lake, Happy Hollow, Barnes Creek and portions of the Aurora Ridge and Lake Angeles trails. The Park has huge areas, including the entire Burke Range, Valhallas, Bailey Range and dozens of other major mountain ridges, the Hayes River, Goldey River, Rustler and dozens of other valleys, glaciers and ocean beaches which shall forever have no trails. If the Park truly wishes to "provide a greater range of wilderness experiences", it should improve and build MORE trails and bridges, not eliminate them.

Finally, we strongly object to two obscure, but highly significant, policy changes. The first is a change from the current Alternative A policy of permitting stock EXCEPT on those trails listed in the annual Superintendent's Compendium as closed to stock. The new proposed policy common to all alternatives is to allow stock ONLY on designated stock trails maintained to stock standards. This denies the use of llamas (and potentially of pack goats) on a long list of trails, exemplified by the upper Queets, Skyline, High Divide, Cedar Lake, Hayden Pass, South Fork Skokomish and Graves Creek Trails. The Park currently has not been able to maintain these trails to stock standards for safe travel with horses and mules, but llamas and pack goats are capable of using them. In addition, some of our members who have used certain trails for years and have experienced, trail-savvy stock, are able to use trails which do not meet stock standards (upper Queets, Cedar Lake, etc.). Their continued use is not now and should not be made illegal. Banning all stock permanently from these trails will needlessly hobble future trail maintenance, search and rescue and natural resources research operations. The wording of the current policy is thoughtfully composed, and it should not be thoughtlessly discarded.

Commercial Pack Services.

The second set of policy changes to which we strongly object are those which would effectively end the last surviving remnants of traditional commercial packing and guide services which were once widely available throughout the Park. Common to all alternatives is a new "Extent Necessary Determination" as to whether these services are the "minimum necessary for the administration of the area as Wilderness". Implicit in this proposal is the idea that riding horses or leading pack stock is an activity which is less than fully compatible with Wilderness. We totally reject this concept as absurd and as a repudiation of our nation's wilderness traditions and history.

No where is this more explicitly stated than under Alternative B "To encourage self-reliant travel and camping, commercial services would be considered appropriate for only the mobility impaired." Who determines what the phrase "mobility impaired" means, a medical specialist, some Park Service committee, or the individual's assessment of their own capabilities relative to their ambitions? What standards apply: ability to hike how many miles and with how much pack weight? Wilderness is intended to provide opportunities for solitude and self reliance, but it provides no regulatory authority for NPS to mandate absolute solitude and self-reliance on all Wilderness visitors.

Many families backpack together, sharing the pack weight of the youngest or more elderly family members, and sharing their Wilderness experience. Shall this be regulated, too? Olympic Wilderness is extensive enough to provide opportunities for both types of experiences. That is its purpose.

In the 1950s, riding horses and pack stock were available at four locations within the Park and at eight Park trailheads for public use without advance notification or permits. Today, none of these facilities survive. This year, the Park imposed a new restriction on its commercial guide services: that they apply 14 days in advance for backcountry permits. Visitors often make last minute changes in their itineraries, due to weather, flight delays, family or medical emergencies, or many other factors outside of the control of guides. Further, NPS already imposes major financial burdens, such as \$1 million liability insurance listing NPS as insured and remittance of a percentage of fees, which render these operations barely viable as ongoing commercial enterprises. This new restriction is unjustified, unnecessary and directly compromises the founding purpose of National Parks: for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.

We remind the Park that it utilizes three mule pack trains in support of its own wilderness trail maintenance work. In place of stock, the Park is increasingly relying on helicopters to replace trail bridges, provide search and rescue, fire management, and routine maintenance and supply of wilderness ranger stations. This is precisely the opposite of what we believe are the Wilderness Ethics which Park management should aspire to embrace in its own operations and promote for Park visitors.

Backcountry Horsemen of Washington values its partnership with Olympic National Park, and appreciates the opportunities we have had over many years to devote thousands of volunteer hours to maintenance of our trail system and assist in a wide variety of both routine and emergency operations for the Park. However, we do not see this partnership valued in the preliminary draft alternatives proposed by the Park. Frankly, it forces us to question whether Park management fully understands the significance of the natural, recreational and historic resources which the public has entrusted to its stewardship.

Stock use is itself deeply intertwined with American wilderness culture and the history of Olympic Wilderness and its trail system. It deserves to be preserved as an explicit goal in all Plan alternatives. Loss of stock use implicitly means increased helicopter use, which should not be a goal of this Plan.

Cultural Resources.

Historic and cultural resources are undervalued in all the draft alternatives. This appears to be a policy change, exemplified in the "Other Features of Value" poster which states that only Native American resources will be addressed. This overturns the 2008 General Management Plan. The GMP set policy to preserve all the historic structures (GMP Appendix E) and cultural landscapes (Appendix F) in the Park. We believe this policy change violates the National Historic Preservation Act. We are distressed to learn that NPS recently drafted a Memorandum of Understanding which would have destroyed the Enchanted Valley Chalet cultural landscape. We are relieved and deeply appreciative that our State Historic Preservation Officer refused to sign it.

Chainsaws.

Backcountry Horsemen of Washington not only use, but have for years also provided certification to our members and for other volunteer trail maintenance groups, in both crosscut and chain saws. Our member sawyers and certifiers have extensive experience clearing both Park and Forest wilderness trails throughout the Olympics.

We adamantly endorse the continued use of chainsaws as the minimum tool necessary to carry out the administrative functions of this Park. Logs fall across trails all seasons of the year, and stop horses. If we cannot clear trails quickly, this can result in emergency situations with loaded pack stock stuck on narrow trails on steep mountainsides where they cannot be turned around safely.

Olympic NP conducted a study of chainsaw and crosscut saw use last summer when clearing the Duckabush Trail. This study should be released in full as an appendix in the draft WSP. We understand the results of this study were, as one would predict, three times more sawyer manpower is required for crosscut saws than for chainsaws. If the study had been conducted on the windward side of the Olympics where the larger rainforest windfall trees fall, the

result would be closer to five times.

It is theoretically possible for Olympic NP to switch from chainsaws to crosscut saws for the majority of its trail maintenance work. This simply requires two things. The additional manpower will require approximately \$1 million per year be added to the trail maintenance budget. The routine use of explosives to clear the largest windfall logs and rootballs from trails, which was widespread routine use by Park trail crews from the 1920s into the 1970s when lightweight chainsaws became available, will have to be resumed.

Plans must be solidly based on reality. If chainsaw use is not continued as the routine minimum tool, then either a drastic increase in trail maintenance budget or a drastic loss of Park trails will result. Full details of the vague "equipment decision tree" proposed in Alternatives B and C, and realistic analysis of its impacts, must be included in this plan. This will have substantial impacts on Park accessibility and Wilderness visitation.

Vision.

Park founders had a clear purpose and a vision, one never fulfilled by NPS, which we feel current Park managers need to embrace anew.

Purpose: "Protection of one of the finest remaining scenic and wilderness areas of the nation, with emphasis on maintenance of wilderness conditions for the benefit of future generations." Trail policy: "The terrain of the park is such that travel without trails is very difficult, either in the higher elevations above timberline or in the lower areas having dense forest cover... Therefore, it is necessary to maintain a large mileage of passable trails if reasonably complete access is to be provided for foot or horse travelers. It is proposed to maintain the park for a principal use as a trail park. Owing to the extremely uneven, broken, precipitous topography, a system of trails becomes necessary, which will probably appear to a casual observer of the park map as almost a gridiron of tortuous trails; yet, in fact, such a trail system will not become in any sense an overdevelopment until years have passed with far more trail construction than is now anticipated." - Olympic National Park Statement of Controlling Development Policies, 1938.

The Park has never fulfilled this vision, instead abandoning a long list of trail projects under construction in the years after the Park was founded, and about 250 miles of trails in the decades since, and now proposing to eliminate or reduce maintenance of even more trails.

Alternative E.

We propose that the Park renew its founding purpose and vision by defining a new Alternative E. This alternative would zone and maintain the entire current Park trail system listed in current Alternative A. It would restore the High Divide Trail to stock standards and reestablish the traditional stock campsite in Cat Basin. It would reopen the Low Divide Trail to stock, enabling stock use of the Mink Lake - Deer Lake loop. It would reopen the O'Neil Pass Trail to stock, reestablish the traditional stock campsites at Marmot Lake and in White Creek basin, and rebuild the stock and foot fords and approaches to the Duckabush River ford above upper Duckabush camp. It would replace dozens of missing footlogs and bridges on trails throughout the Park, using traditional log construction techniques supported by pack stock, rather than expensive prefabricated steel or cable bridges which must be flown in using helicopters. And it would reaffirm the policy set in the General Management Plan to preserve the full range of the Park's cultural resources.

There are a few trail construction projects which should be considered in Alternative E.

The final half-mile of the North Fork Sol Duc Trail, surveyed and under construction in 1940, could be easily completed to Boulder Lake. In 2012, a hiker became lost trying to locate this trail, fell down a steep slope, and broke an ankle. He was very fortunate to be located by search and rescue and airlifted out. Completing this trail would end this recurrent safety issue. It would also provide pack stock access, necessary for continued maintenance of the North Fork Sol Duc Shelter, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The historic trail route along the east bank of the Ozette River from Ozette RS to the south end of south Duk Point beach might be reopened. The first mile would be on an old roadbed, the remaining 1.7 miles on old trail route. This

would provide rare access to old-growth coastal Sitka spruce rain forest, and a route which does not require fording the mouth of the Ozette River, which is often unsafe when tides or rainfall raise the river level. It would allow Cape Alava loop hikes when well-timed at low tide.

We propose this Alternative E to renew this Park's focus on the founding purpose of the National Park Service: to promote the use of National Parks 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. We believe in the Wilderness Act, which states the designation of any area of any park as a wilderness area shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for its use and preservation in accordance with this purpose. Alternatives B, C and D lack this vision. Clearly, a new Alternative E is required with a clear focus on fulfilling this purpose.

Sincerely,
Cate Bencock, President
Peninsula Chapter, Backcountry Horsemen of Washington

Correspondence ID:	996	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 21:17:38				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				
Yes, this was a sufficient range of alternatives.					

Topic Question 2:

I like the alternatives that encourage the use of bear canisters and "pack-it in, pack-it out" philosophy, including waste toilet paper.

I think managing the human impact in a sensible way is important, while maintaining opportunities for solitude and protecting the environment. Trails should match user levels; for example, poorly maintained trails that are heavily used can degrade the environment.

A range of user opportunities is important while emphasizing protection of the wilderness and limiting human impact on it (especially near streams, lakes, rivers, wetlands and alpine meadows.

Topic Question 3:

I did not find specific elements that should be changed, since several options are presented. Increased human use of the Skyline Ridge (Queets/Quinault divide) area should not be encouraged. It is a wild and fragile place and should remain that way. Care should be taken to prevent access to the wilderness by dogs.

Comments: The wilderness plan should address the following issues that are of present concern:

1. Dog access to the wilderness, especially Rialto beach past Ellen Creek, Second Beach, and Third Beach. Increased enforcement, user education and signage should be used.
2. Current regulations around bear can use are often not followed. Increased education, and enforcement should be used. Bear can use should be expanded.
3. Strong enforcement of the ban on fires in alpine areas should continue or be enhanced.
4. The wilderness nature of Second Beach, Rialto Beach and Third Beach should be protected. These areas get heavy use by non-wilderness activities, such as large parties, fireworks, large beach fires, intoxicated users and users with dogs.
5. Wilderness areas with limited human impact in the alpine areas should be protected. Human access should be maintained, but increased use should not occur. Examples include the Skyline Ridge trail area, way trails from the Hamma Hamma to First Divide, and the Bailey Range.

6. New users of the Olympic Backcountry should speak with a ranger. The existing wilderness annual pass system could be used to allow properly trained users to obtain permits without visiting a ranger station. Self-service permits stations are a common area where rule and regs are not followed.

Olympic National Park and Wilderness is a very special place that should be protected and treasured!

Correspondence ID: 997 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Yes.

Topic Question 2:

I liked that you planned to remove all structures from designated Wilderness. But now you have changed your mind. Please meet the letter and spirit of the law by planning to remove or allow to deteriorate all structures within Wilderness.

Topic Question 3:

No.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 998 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 21:30:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. Alternative D does not meet the conceptual vision to "provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences." The range alternatives for Visitor Use and Experience is not sufficient for a comprehensive analysis. Either the Visitor Use and Experience section of Alternative D needs to extensively revised to more accurately reflect the conceptual vision, or the conceptual vision for Alternative D should be modified and an additional Alternative E should be provided. See additional comments below.

Topic Question 2:

An adequate range of alternatives are provided for Natural Resources, Cultural Resources, Park Operations, and Memberships and Outreach. I support the Wilderness Zoning concept as a means to provide management guidance.

Topic Question 3:

I would revise several elements in the Visitor Use and Experience section, particularly those applicable to alternative D that does not adequately meet the conceptual vision to "provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences." See additional comments below.

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Olympic National Park's Wilderness Stewardship Plan- Preliminary Draft Alternatives.

Over the past 15 years I have enjoyed many adventures in Olympic National Park as a research scientist, teacher, and an individual who personally enjoys recreating in the spectacular old-growth forests and wild free-flowing rivers. The comments below are my personal comments and do not represent the official views of my past or present employers.

As a teacher I have worked for Nature Bridge, University of Washington, and Cornell University and have led

dozens of field trips into the Olympic National Park wilderness for park staff, students (from grade school children to individuals participating in adult education programs), media, Congressional staff, and members of the public. As a research scientist I have worked primarily along the Queets River where I spent two years working in the Park. My research was featured as a cover story in the Seattle Times (<http://seattletimes.com/pacificnw/2005/0130/cover.html>) and has been published in academic journals (O'Keefe, T.C. and R.J. Naiman. 2006. The influence of forest structure on riparian litterfall in a Pacific Coastal rain forest. *Can. J. For. Res.* 36(11):2852-2863; and Van Pelt, R., T.C. O'Keefe, J.J. Lattterell, and R.J. Naiman. 2006. Riparian forest stand development along the Queets River in Olympic National Park, Washington. *Ecol. Monogr.* 76:277-298.) On my free weekends and holidays, I enjoy recreating in the Park and particularly enjoy the outstanding opportunities for backcountry kayaking. My photographs and writing from these experiences have been published in the American Whitewater Journal and other publications. The stewardship of Olympic National Park is important to me personally and professionally as a river ecologist and teacher who recognizes the lessons this place can teach us about free-flowing rivers and the temperate coastal rainforest.

Range of Alternatives

My primary concern with the alternatives presented is that Alternative D, and specifically the section on Visitor Use and Enjoyment, does not meet the objectives outlined in the conceptual vision to "provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences." In addition this alternative, and others considered, appear to be inconsistent with the management goals and framework that were only recently established as part of the General Management Plan (Olympic National Park, Final General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, March 2008, Pages 428-430). In several respects, Alternatives B and C appear to reduce the range of wilderness experiences. I suggest that you keep alternatives B and C with their concept visions to reduce the human imprint and protect natural resources respectively for purposes of analysis. However I recommend that you modify alternative D to reflect a concept vision of maintaining the current range of visitor experiences and add a new alternative E with a concept vision to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experience. It is important to have this alternative E in light of the National Park Service objectives to "expand the use of parks as places for healthy outdoor recreation that contributes to people's physical, mental, and social well-being." This objective is outlined in the National Park Service publication *A Call to Action, Preparing for a Second Century of Stewardship and Engagement*.

Need for Justification

I understand and appreciate that the documents provided for comment were produced prior to any formal analysis and appreciate and thank you for providing this comment opportunity. In the next stage of this process when alternatives are analyzed, I request that you include a needs analysis to justify actions you are considering that will degrade opportunities for an "unconfined type of recreation" that are to be protected as part of the statutory requirements of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. Â§ 1131.c.2). While I recognize that regulations to manage visitor behavior and limits on use (i.e. permit systems and quotas) are important to protect natural resource values and the quality of the wilderness experience, the cumulative impact of too many management restrictions on visitor behavior can degrade the opportunities for primitive and unconfined type of recreation. This point is outlined in *Keeping It Wild in the National Park Service: A User Guide to Integrating Wilderness Character into Park Planning, Management, and Monitoring*, Page 9. WASO 909/121797, January 2014. The Olympic National Park Stewardship Plan- Preliminary Draft Alternatives Newsletter incorrectly states that it is only "facilities provided by the agency or created by users" that degrades this element of wilderness character; in fact, management restrictions can degrade this quality too. I am concerned that too many of the preliminary draft alternatives include actions that are applied across the entire Park as blanket prescriptions. I feel it would be more appropriate to institute specific standards and guidelines that are outlined in the future Wilderness Stewardship Plan, and then implement management actions when triggers are met through amendments to the Superintendent's Compendium. Such an approach would provide more flexibility over the life of the the Wilderness Stewardship Plan while still providing an appropriate administrative framework to guide future management actions.

Specific Comments

Scientific Research

As an individual who has conducted research in Olympic National Park, I support the objectives that are outlined in

the Common to All Action alternatives. I do not support Alternative B that puts blanket restrictions on all manipulative research. While it may be appropriate to minimize this type of research, Olympic National Park provides a rare opportunity to study a temperate coastal rainforest that is largely intact and some level of manipulation can be necessary to better understand ecosystem processes- -examples include elk exclosures to understand processes that affect vegetation community structure and development, radio collaring of elk to understand elk behavior, and live captures of fish species for tagging studies that enhance our understanding of fish distribution and movement. In my experience, the research coordinators at the Park have done an excellent job of evaluating proposals and soliciting outside expertise to inform their decisions. When proposals for manipulative research are evaluated, the coordinator typically challenges researchers to justify why the specific project can only be completed in the wilderness setting of Olympic National Park. This practice should continue, and researchers should be provided with the opportunity to justify specific projects for manipulative research that are evaluated on their individual merits.

Permits

I believe a range of alternatives should be provided to issue permits: in-person, self-registration, telephone, and online. This is particularly important for Olympic National Park given the numerous points of entry that are available and not staffed. I am concerned with alternatives that require staff to be available at the time the permit is obtained. Most of my personal use of the park wilderness occurs during the time from late fall to early spring when staffing resources are generally low. The benefits of an in-person registration system for visitor education and Leave No Trace instruction is undeniable, but the Park should look to enhancing resources for online instruction and education. Many organizations provide online information on recreational opportunities in Olympic National Park as well as instruction on how to enjoy the outdoors. The Park should partner with these organizations to direct their members and website visitors to information on wilderness stewardship and Leave No Trace practices.

Quotas and Use Limits

Quotas and use limits are an important tool when specific sites are at or in danger of exceeding ecological or social capacity. The ecosystem and social science of establishing these limits can be challenging but needs to be done if such limits are seriously considered. I do not understand why Alternative D is the only one that states that "quotas/use limits would be established for overnight and day use." This is clearly inconsistent with the concept vision to "provide visitors with greater range of wilderness experiences" and even more restrictive than the alternative B that states that "quotas and use limits for day use would be considered for high use areas." There are a few examples of day use limits in the National Park system: Half Dome in Yosemite National Park, The Narrows in Zion National Park, specific ruins such as Cliff Palace in Mesa Verde National Park, and cave tours in Wind Cave National Park to name a few. These examples tend to represent the exception however, and the application of park-wide day use limits "throughout the wilderness" are not appropriate for Olympic National Park. Similarly, limits for overnight use should be limited to specific locations.

Food Storage

I encourage flexibility in the food storage requirements and recommend continued implementation of the requirements outlined in the Superintendent's Compendium that suspended food must be a minimum of 12 feet from the ground and 10 feet horizontally from any fixed object, and if this is not possible then a bear-resistant food container is required. Much of the discussion has centered on the use and maintenance of bear wires. Most of my own travel within the wilderness has been off the established trail network along river corridors where there were no bear wires so I have not found them to be essential. I have also spent extensive time traveling in bear country including two summers in the field in Alaska where I worked along salmon streams with extremely high densities of brown bears. My personal preference is to use a Wild Ideas Bearikade <<http://www.wild-ideas.net/>> which I own. These containers have an o-ring seal which keeps your food dry, they are easier to pack than other alternatives, and they also keep out rodents and other small mammals. When I choose lightweight high-caloric foods I have been able to pack up to 10 days worth of food in my Bearikade. The Bearikade does not work for all situations however. When I am on an overnight trip in my hard shell kayak- -my Bearikade does not fit in the boat- -I use an Ursack <<http://www.ursack.com/>> and suspend it using the PCT method <<http://theultimatehang.com/2013/03/hanging-a-bear-bag-the-pct-method/>>. Despite my best meal planning and packing efforts there have also been situations where I wanted to add "one more food item" that does not quite fit in the Bearikade; in those situations it is helpful to

supplement the storage space of the Bearikade with an Ursack. Finally, when I do solo weekend backpacking trips my preference is to run light with a small 18 lb. pack which generally means I leave the stove at home, pack high caloric food that does not require cooking, and pack my food in an Ursack.

Instead of requiring all wilderness visitors to use "bear canisters" as contemplated in Alternatives B, C, and D, I would ask that you evaluate an alternative that requires "bear resistant food containers" and suspending food that is in soft-sided containers as is currently outlined in the Superintendent's Compendium. The key to making this work is to ensure that visitors have adequate education in how to suspend food properly. These education efforts should emphasize that bear canisters are the preferred method, but provide flexibility for those situations where it is not feasible or adequate. At lower elevations, there is certainly no shortage of trees to properly suspend food in Olympic National Park and it is only a matter of providing the education necessary to do it correctly. If you could implement this approach, you could eliminate the need to maintain bear wires.

Waste Management

I have personally used wag bags in areas of limited organic soil and along river corridors (i.e. areas of high use). This approach to waste management has long been used by river runners and is increasingly being accepted by other user groups, something that should be encouraged by Olympic National Park. Many of the wilderness areas in Olympic National Park, particularly in low elevation areas of Zone 6 where I have traveled, have rich organic soils that are suitable for burying human waste. In my experience, it's often the toilet paper management that is a bigger issue than the human waste. While the presence of privies may have an impact on wilderness character, the health and sanitation benefits make them a necessary component of an overall sanitation strategy. The General Management Plan acknowledges this reality and notes that most of the wilderness area (i.e. the majority of Zone 6) does not include any such facilities. I encourage the proposal in the Common to All Action alternatives to evaluate new options for toilet types and increased educational efforts. The importance of tackling this issue is especially apparent in the coastal areas of the Park. Human waste bags can be a challenge for long trips or for parents who are taking children into the wilderness. One of the first wilderness trips I did with my own kids was a backpacking trip on the Olympic Coast- -a trip I did before my son was even a year old. Carrying camping gear, food, clothing, and the dirty diapers out, I don't believe it would have been possible for me to carry the human waste out for three people on my own.

Campfire

I generally do not make a campfire when I am in the wilderness. In areas of high use campfires result in depletion of the local wood supply and a proliferation of fire rings can detract from the visitor experience. Alternative B would prohibit fires on the wilderness coastal strip. While fires are generally not necessary I have been out on the coast when temperatures were colder than expected and a fire became a necessity. Current fire regulations outlined in the Superintendent's Compendium seem appropriate and any proposed change to these requirements should be clearly justified.

Hiking Trails/Access

I am concerned with the concept in the Common to All Action alternatives that no new trails would be constructed. Opportunities for new trail construction are likely to be extremely limited and in most cases are likely most appropriate in front-country areas where additional day-use opportunities may be needed. That being said, trails are the way to experience this Park and new trail construction is not prohibited by the Wilderness Act. Any trail proposal would require a full environmental analysis, but the establishment of new trail routes should not be explicitly prohibited. Reducing the trail mileage and class, as contemplated in Alternative B would clearly be inconsistent with the General Management Plan.

Ranger-led hikes and programs

As an individual who has led programs in the Olympic Park wilderness, I have witnessed first-hand the benefits of using the wilderness as an outdoor classroom where students and visitors can experience the elements of the temperate coastal rainforest. While learning opportunities are available in visitor centers and along front country trails such as those in the Hoh Rainforest, the Park wilderness provides a unique environment for facilitated self

discovery. Many individuals learn on their own but first-time visitors and those who have more limited training in basic ecology benefit from and enjoy the opportunity to enrich their learning experience by spending time with a trained professional in the field. The General Management Plan discusses the importance of "helping people make meaningful connections" and interpretive hikes and programs are critical to meeting this objective.

Correspondence ID: 999 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,17,2014 22:07:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. Alternative A, the current Backcountry Management Plan and full trail system, needs to be included as a zoned Action Alternative E which can be directly compared with the other action alternatives. Several trails should be upgraded and returned to their "all purpose" design standards. Limited restoration of abandoned or incomplected trails should be considered, such as completion of the North Fork Sol Duc Trail and restoration of the east bank Ozette River trail to south Duk Point beach, enabling a Cape Alava hiking loop.

Topic Question 2:

They certainly have prompted public discussion of the stark choices proposed. All of the action alternatives B, C or D offer dismal prospects for recreation and historic preservation, compared to Alternative A and the General Management Plan. They also fail to fulfill their promise of a broader range of Wilderness experiences or improved stewardship of natural resources.

Comments: Trails budget.

Historically, for the first half of Olympic NP's 75 year history, the majority - over half - of its budget went to trail maintenance and construction. Today, that percentage is much smaller, well below 10%. It is not adequate to maintain the current trail system annually; roughly only 2/3 of Park trails receive annual maintenance on average. It takes the Park trail system several years to recover from each "hundred year storm", and that recovery never completely replaces all lost bridges or restores all damaged trails to their previous condition.

Alternative D might be regarded as an attempt to "right size" the Park trail system with its current budget. Alternatives B and C go further, lowering maintenance standards and reducing the extent of the trail system, in particular of trail bridges (which are labor-intensive and expensive to replace).

The other alternative is to increase trails manpower and budget. The growing volunteer trail maintenance effort (SCA, WCC, BCHW, WTA, other groups and individuals) can help do so. Major trail projects, such as bridge construction, are also funded via Park entrance and backcountry and guide permit fees. This fee revenue averages about \$2.4 million/year, equivalent to 1/5 of the Park's allocated base budget.

In 2007, the Park proposed raising fees to keep pace with inflation. The proposal was not supported by the public responses, and the proposal was shelved. The Park needs to build public support over time for higher fees in the future. But I don't recall the Park has even once issued a press release summarizing all the good projects of direct benefit to Park visitors funded each year by user fees. It should be doing so at least once, if not twice, every year. The Park should have a strong story to tell here. Only by telling it, repeatedly, year after year, will the Park build public support for higher fee income in the future.

Nor has the Park issued press releases on its major backcountry trail achievements, such as construction of the Staircase Rapids bridge or reconstruction of the North Fork Quinault trail after the 2007 floods. These deserve public recognition.

Of course, this fee income will have to be perceived by the public have having been used efficiently. Some recent Park road and building contracts appear to be much more expensive than comparable private, county and city projects. Part of the reason may be inherent in the Federal contracting requirements, but some other Federal agencies are perceived as being able to contract more competitively on comparable projects. USFS often has projects similar to those of NPS, but operates in a far more transparent manner, with public planning meetings, bids and project

press releases disclosing costs and progress. This builds and maintains public support for the Legacy Roads and Trails funding which was initiated by Congress to fund these projects.

This Wilderness Stewardship Plan is not a mere abstract exercise among competing philosophies (human imprint, natural resources, recreation). It is tied to concrete realities, budget and public support. There is a fundamental mismatch between the greater transparency the public expects of agencies in the 21st century, and the traditional paternalistic opacity to which NPS instinctively clings.

This was never so apparent as with the park additions proposed in the 2008 General Management Plan. The Park's strongest supporter, Rep. Norm Dicks, initially included them in his draft "Wild Olympics" legislation. He repeatedly stressed these would be "willing seller only" additions. But distrust of Park management runs so deep in Grays Harbor county and the west side that he found them politically untenable and was forced to delete them. This is the legacy of decades of lack of communication, as well as a long history of both Park actions and inactions which cumulatively have eroded campgrounds, trails and public recreational use, particularly in this south and west sides of the Park.

For NPS to be successful, for example to gain public support for higher fees to support our trail system, it must become much more open and transparent.

Correspondence ID:	1000	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:				

a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.

b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.

c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.

d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.

e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Correspondence ID:	1001	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Friends of Olympic Trail Shelters Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,17,2014 22:27:09				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1: No, and this comment illustrates why, for one specific trail.				

Comments: The draft Alternatives and zones leave the public confused as to the actual impact of each alternative on specific trails and structures they care about. One solution is to supply a short narrative on each trail. Here, I draft one for a specific trail to illustrate the information and considerations that the public would need to understand the impacts of each alternative. It also illustrates that stock access is linked to future maintenance of both trail structures and historic structures, and demands more detailed consideration on each trail. So I propose two additional alternatives that might address these issues.

North Fork Sol Duc Trail.

Currently, the footlog at mile 1 is missing, and the ford is generally too deep and swift to allow safe foot crossing until mid- or late July. Approaches to the stream crossings at mile 4.5, 6 and 7.5 are washed out and impassable to stock. A stock camp site is located near mile 5. The trail is maintained for foot travel to the North Fork Sol Duc Shelter, in very good condition, restored in 2000 and listed on the National Register of Historic Places, at mile 9. Abandoned trail continues, climbing through four switchbacks, to mile 10.5, where it ends. Cross-country travel may be continued 1/2 mile to intersect the Happy Lake Ridge Trail, just north of Boulder Lake.

The design lifetime of a cedar shake roof is approximately 30 years, so it will need to be replaced within the lifetime of this WSP. Re-roofing requires approximately 14 bundles of shakes weighing 1000 pounds. Cedar is not available near the shelter site, which is dominated by grand fir.

In 2012, a hiker coming from Boulder Lake failed to locate the route, broke an ankle attempting to descend to the upper North Fork Sol Duc tributary upstream of the shelter. Search and rescue located the hiker and he was airlifted out for medical treatment (Peninsula Daily News, August 30, 2012). This is not the first incident of this kind, indicating an ongoing safety hazard which should be addressed in the WSP.

Preliminary Draft WSP Alternatives.

Alternative A: the first 7 miles are listed as Stock trail, miles 7 to 9 to the shelter as Primitive trail, and miles 9 to 11 as unmaintained way trail. The footlog at mile 1 may be replaced, if budget permits. Future maintenance of the shelter would be supported by helicopter.

Alternative B: the first 7 miles as zone 4 primitive foot trail, miles 7 to 9 zone 5 way trail, and miles 9 to 11 as zone 6 primeval wilderness. Stock would be prohibited. Future maintenance of the North Fork Sol Duc Shelter would be (please specify either: supported by helicopter) or (discontinued). The footlog at mile 1 will not be replaced.

Alternative C: the first 7 miles zone 3 secondary foot trail, miles 7 to 9 as zone 4 primitive foot trail, and miles 9 to 11 as zone 6 primeval wilderness. Stock would be prohibited. Future maintenance of the North Fork Sol Duc Shelter would be (please specify either: supported by helicopter) or (discontinued). The footlog at mile 1 will not be replaced.

Alternative D: the first 7 miles as zone 3 secondary stock trail, miles 7 to 9 as zone 4 primitive foot trail, miles 9 to 11 as zone 5 way trail. North Fork Sol Duc Shelter would not be accessible to stock, and its future maintenance will be (please specify either: supported by helicopter) or (discontinued). The footlog at mile 1 (will / will not) be replaced.

Proposed alternatives.

Alternative E: Volunteers will be permitted to replace the footlog at mile 1. The 7 miles will be zone 3 secondary stock trail, approach to the stream crossing at mile 4.5 repaired with a crib wall, and the stock camp site designated near mile 5. Miles 7 to 9 zone 4 primitive foot trail, miles 9 to 11 zone 5 way trail. The final 1/2 mile will be marked with permanent cairns, and the junction with the Happy Lake Ridge Trail will be signed, so hikers will not become lost in the future. North Fork Sol Duc Shelter would not be accessible to stock, and its future maintenance may be supported by helicopter.

Alternative F: The first mile to the footlog will be zone 3 stock trail, and volunteers will be permitted to replace the footlog at mile 1. Miles 1 to 9 zone 4 primitive foot trail to the shelter. The final 1/2 mile will be completed, and the final 2 miles cleared, becoming zone 3 secondary stock trail, providing stock access to enable future maintenance of the North Fork Sol Duc Shelter and avoiding hikers becoming lost in future. This alternative is easier and cheaper than Alt. E, and addresses future maintenance and safety issues. If budget or volunteer manpower permits, the stream crossings will be repaired and the entire trail maintained as zone 3 secondary stock trail.

Each trail in the Park has a constituency, who are trying to understand the concrete implications of the proposed

alternatives on the accessibility and maintenance of the trail. This is not an abstract philosophical discussion, but will have real impacts on Park visitors and structures for decades - impacts that should be fully disclosed in the draft plan.

Correspondence ID: 1002 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
see below

Topic Question 2:
see below

Topic Question 3:
see below

Comments: Support the management approach described in Alternative B including the following provisions and modifications:

- a. prohibit the use of motorized equipment and motorized transport, such as helicopters, except for in emergencies. Ensure that research activities and other administrative functions adhere to these rules.
- b. prohibit new structures, installations and developments unless essential to protecting an untrammeled wilderness. Buildings such as the trail shelters and cabins distract from wilderness character, as these are largely artifacts of Forest Service and Park Service management on the Olympic Mountains.
- c. leave cultural resources undisturbed, and where they are threatened by natural processes, natural processes will prevail.
- d. allow natural processes to operate unimpeded. Limit human-engineered restoration activities to minor, site-specific restoration such as repairing trail or campsite damage or removing unnecessary structures.
- e. confine nature trails to the frontcountry, do not include highly developed or interpretive trails in the Wilderness.

Keep it Wild! Your attention to this most urgent matter would be much appreciated by all present & future generations of all species.

Thank you
Lydia Garvey Public Health Nurse

Correspondence ID: 1003 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:
Only Plan B is acceptable.

Topic Question 2:
The wilderness needs to stay wilderness.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 1004 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,17,2014 23:29:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:
Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society

"Promoting Birding and Conservation as Community Educators, Volunteers, and Stewards"

P.O Box 502 Sequim, WA 98382

May 17, 2014.

Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan Preliminary Draft Alternatives

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

On behalf of the Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society (OPAS), we are writing to express our support for the ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan Preliminary Draft Alternatives. OPAS commends Olympic National Park staff for carefully crafting each Alternative with environmental stewardship that maintains the purposes and elements of the Wilderness Act. Olympic National Park is a valuable environment for birds, fish and wildlife that thrive in or near the rivers and forests of the diverse ecosystems contained in the Park's wilderness areas.

OPAS primarily supports the concept vision of Alternative C with emphasis placed on the protection of natural resources. This Alternative best reflects our continuing efforts to protect habitat in the Olympic Peninsula's wilderness forests and watersheds. We also recommend elements from Alternative B and D for inclusion into the Preferred Alternative:

Alternative C:

• Fire Management: Implements the best protection for natural resources without compromising protection for administrative and historic structures.

• Stock Use: Best determines the number of open trail miles that would be reduced to levels the park is able to maintain to appropriate trail standards.

• Trail Maintenance: Offers the best option for trails that would be maintained at the standards necessary to protect natural resources and reduce impacts of hikers and stock on those resources. Note: Foot trail maintenance should be emphasized.

• Campfire Restrictions: Implements the best campfire restrictions that would be increased in high use areas where fuel gathering activities negatively affect natural resources.

• Historic Structures: Instructs practical methods when historic structures are threatened by natural processes. No effort would be made to alter the natural process for the protection of the historic structure. No historic structures would be reconstructed. Note: Recognizing Park budgetary constraints, we support one recommendation from Alternative B: Historic structures threatened by natural processes would not be relocated.

• Bridge Management: Provides practical and natural resources protection instruction on bridge management. New or replacement bridges, foot logs, or water crossings may be installed to reduce impacts on the riparian and riverine systems. Note: From Alternative D, we support the need to assess which trails should have bridges. This may include adding new bridges and/or removing others. OPAS agrees that efforts should be made to increase education and awareness about safe methods for water crossings.

• Waste Management: Human waste bags would be required in the subalpine and above (areas with little or no organic soil for cat holes) that don't have other facilities available.

• Cultural Landscapes: Provides the best determination of which cultural landscapes would be maintained to the extent practicable, according to pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values. Note: We support inclusion of Alternative D elements to provide Native American access to cultural landscapes, such as coastal prairies.

• Scientific Research: Provides the most flexible mechanism during the research permitting process to evaluate what level of manipulative research is appropriate for scientific research.

Alternative B:

• Aircraft Use: Best restricts aircraft use within the park, including NPS-related use. Flights will be limited to activities involving life or health threatening emergencies, the administration and/or protection of resources, and individually-approved special purpose missions.

Alternative D:

• Ranger-led Hikes: Provides the best approach for allowing visitors to experience the wilderness by increasing ranger-led interpretive hikes, but limiting group size.

• Ethnographic Resources: Allows Park managers to provide tribal access to ethnographic resources to the extent practicable by law and policy.

• Wildlife Management - Fisheries: Continue to promote sport-fishing using artificial lures (to catch non-native fish in an effort to reduce the population) consistent with other wilderness values of the high mountain lakes. Note: Recognizing Park budgetary restraints, removing non-native fish may not be economically feasible as outlined in Alternative C.

We respectfully request that access issues for aging population be added to the planning process. While we support the continued and improved protection of wilderness areas of ONP, we also believe that provisions and access to a wilderness experience not be restricted to those that are young, strong, and in top physical condition. Our National Parks suffer from decreasing public use. Well-conceived plans and policies need to be implemented that will allow lesser able folks the opportunity to experience and learn the value of wilderness. We realize the challenge that such planning entails, but we also believe visitors learning the full value of wilderness is essential for the long term citizen support of our Parks.

The recommendations that are common to all action alternatives (CTAA) and the recommendations common to all alternatives (CTA) are appropriate for a stewardship plan that protects wilderness. Planning, resourcing, and implementing actions will require a full engagement of wilderness stewards, policymakers, and the public to grasp and assess the implications of climatic changes. Recognizing the challenges of a decrease in the National Park budget and the possibility of unforeseen threats to wildlife and habitat from climate change may require some park management flexibility to address these issues.

We are grateful to the Park's interdisciplinary planning team for providing the public with carefully drafted Alternatives that identify key topics from the scoping comments and the visitor use study. The additional data about wilderness resources played a key role in determining appropriate management prescriptions. We are encouraged that the planning process will ensure the development of the best possible future for the Olympic National Park wilderness.

Sincerely,

Mary Porter-Solberg

Bob Phreaner

Co-chairs Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society

Correspondence ID: 1005 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,17,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This is a resend. Your comment form does not allow my word document to come through correctly.

Comments: Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society

"Promoting Birding and Conservation as Community Educators,Volunteers, and Stewards"

P.O Box 502 Sequim, WA 98382

May 17, 2014.

Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Olympic National Park
600 E. Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan Preliminary Draft Alternatives

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

On behalf of the Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society (OPAS), we are writing to express our support for the ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan Preliminary Draft Alternatives. OPAS commends Olympic National Park staff for carefully crafting each Alternative with environmental stewardship that maintains the purposes and elements of the Wilderness Act. Olympic National Park is a valuable environment for birds, fish and wildlife that thrive in or near the rivers and forests of the diverse ecosystems contained in the Park's wilderness areas.

OPAS primarily supports the concept vision of Alternative C with emphasis placed on the protection of natural resources. This Alternative best reflects our continuing efforts to protect habitat in the Olympic Peninsula's wilderness forests and watersheds. We also recommend elements from Alternative B and D for inclusion into the Preferred Alternative:

Alternative C:

•Fire Management: Implements the best protection for natural resources without compromising protection for administrative and historic structures.

•Stock Use: Best determines the number of open trail miles that would be reduced to levels the park is able to maintain to appropriate trail standards.

•Trail Maintenance: Offers the best option for trails that would be maintained at the standards necessary to protect natural resources and reduce impacts of hikers and stock on those resources. Note: Foot trail maintenance should be emphasized.

•Campfire Restrictions: Implements the best campfire restrictions that would be increased in high use areas where fuel gathering activities negatively affect natural resources.

â€¢Historic Structures: Instructs practical methods when historic structures are threatened by natural processes. No effort would be made to alter the natural process for the protection of the historic structure. No historic structures would be reconstructed. Note: Recognizing Park budgetary constraints, we support one recommendation from Alternative B: Historic structures threatened by natural processes would not be relocated.

â€¢Bridge Management: Provides practical and natural resources protection instruction on bridge management. New or replacement bridges, foot logs, or water crossings may be installed to reduce impacts on the riparian and riverine systems. Note: From Alternative D, we support the need to assess which trails should have bridges. This may include adding new bridges and/or removing others. OPAS agrees that efforts should be made to increase education and awareness about safe methods for water crossings.

â€¢Waste Management: Human waste bags would be required in the subalpine and above (areas with little or no organic soil for cat holes) that don't have other facilities available.

â€¢Cultural Landscapes: Provides the best determination of which cultural landscapes would be maintained to the extent practicable, according to pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values. Note: We support inclusion of Alternative D elements to provide Native American access to cultural landscapes, such as coastal prairies.

â€¢Scientific Research: Provides the most flexible mechanism during the research permitting process to evaluate what level of manipulative research is appropriate for scientific research.

Alternative B:

â€¢Aircraft Use: Best restricts aircraft use within the park, including NPS-related use. Flights will be limited to activities involving life or health threatening emergencies, the administration and/or protection of resources, and individually-approved special purpose missions.

Alternative D:

â€¢Ranger-led Hikes: Provides the best approach for allowing visitors to experience the wilderness by increasing ranger-led interpretive hikes, but limiting group size.

â€¢Ethnographic Resources: Allows Park managers to provide tribal access to ethnographic resources to the extent practicable by law and policy.

â€¢Wildlife Management - Fisheries: Continue to promote sport-fishing using artificial lures (to catch non-native fish in an effort to reduce the population) consistent with other wilderness values of the high mountain lakes. Note: Recognizing Park budgetary restraints, removing non-native fish may not be economically feasible as outlined in Alternative C.

We respectfully request that access issues for aging population be added to the planning process. While we support the continued and improved protection of wilderness areas of ONP, we also believe that provisions and access to a wilderness experience not be restricted to those that are young, strong, and in top physical condition. Our National Parks suffer from decreasing public use. Well-conceived plans and policies need to be implemented that will allow lesser able folks the opportunity to experience and learn the value of wilderness. We realize the challenge that such planning entails, but we also believe visitors learning the full value of wilderness is essential for the long term citizen support of our Parks.

The recommendations that are common to all action alternatives (CTAA) and the recommendations common to all alternatives (CTA) are appropriate for a stewardship plan that protects wilderness. Planning, resourcing, and implementing actions will require a full engagement of wilderness stewards, policymakers, and the public to grasp and assess the implications of climatic changes. Recognizing the challenges of a decrease in the National Park budget and the possibility of unforeseen threats to wildlife and habitat from climate change may require some park management flexibility to address these issues.

We are grateful to the Park's interdisciplinary planning team for providing the public with carefully drafted

Alternatives that identify key topics from the scoping comments and the visitor use study. The additional data about wilderness resources played a key role in determining appropriate management prescriptions. We are encouraged that the planning process will ensure the development of the best possible future for the Olympic National Park wilderness.

Sincerely,

Mary Porter-Solberg

Bob Phreaner

Co-chairs Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society

Correspondence ID:	1006	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Back Country Horsemen of WA Peninsula Chapter Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,17,2014 23:52:19				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes I think this is a sufficient range of alternatives, but I personally feel that none of the alternatives except Alternative A, which is continue to manage the park in a way similar to how it is being managed now, fit my thoughts on how ONP should be managed.

Topic Question 2:

As a stock user and a hiker I feel all alternatives except Alternative A, which is the "No Action" alternative, are far too restrictive. Currently stock use is allowed on roughly 360 miles of ONP trails, Alternative A would continue to allow us use on all those miles.

Alternative B could lead to us losing over 100 miles of stock trails that we now have access to, including Wolf Creek, the Queets, the Low Divide, Mink Lake and a few others.

Alternative C could lead to us losing roughly 175 miles of trails for stock use including the main fork of the Dosewallips, the Sol Duc, including the High Divide, Appleton Pass, Hayden Pass, Olympic Hot Springs and others. Alternative D only reduces our stock trail miles by about 20 miles, but does possibly restrict our use on some trails to day-use only.

So with that said it seems that Alternative A is not only a stock users obvious choice, but also should be a hiker or backpackers best choice of alternatives. If stock use is restricted on any more miles of trails it will make it nearly impossible for hiking trails to be maintained as well. ONP trails were built by stock back in the early 1900's and continue to be maintained by stock today. Mother Nature works hard in ONP to close off the trails with downed trees, slides and blown out bridges; to expect trail crews to maintain the trails without the assistance of stock packing in tools, materials and provisions would quickly shut down many miles of trails for the average hiker and backpacker.

Topic Question 3:

Again I feel that Alternative A is the best choice for me and my family as stock users, hikers and backpackers. I do feel that the four alternatives with their many different elements may be too overwhelming for most folks to comment on, or for that matter even read and fully understand. I hope the ONP will narrow some things down and again ask for comments so that more and better feedback will hopefully be provided. Unfortunately many of the old timers that know what ONP used to be, in terms of historic structures and trail conditions, are probably not able to participate in this kind of format. They probably don't even have printers to print off the alternatives for reading, or even have computers for that matter to be able to submit comments or be able to read the stewardship plan, so I hope that if you entertain another round of comments you will have hard copies of the draft plan available for folks who

aren't technologically capable so that you can get a wider range of comments.

Comments: I would like to thank Olympic National Park for accepting comments on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan and I hope that all comments will be seriously considered. I hope that perhaps ONP might even entertain another round of comments when a draft is closer to completion.

The history of ONP makes it very special to me. My ancestors have been in this area since the late 1800's, so ONP after its creation in the 1930's was a big part of my family's history, both in stories that I remember from my childhood and photographs. My great grandma, great aunts and uncles, and even my father all worked at ONP throughout the years, so ever since I was little ONP has always been a part of my life. The park was created for the enjoyment of the people and I would like to continue to see it maintained that way so that my children's children can experience the park to the extent that their ancestors did.

When Olympic National Park was created in 1938 nearly 1,100 miles of trails were inherited from the US Forest Service, most which were built by stock, so therefore built and maintained to stock standards. Of those 1,100 miles only around 600 miles remain today, and of those only around 360 are maintained for stock use. The trails today continue to be maintained with the help of stock to pack in tools, materials and provisions for crews, so ensuring that the maximum miles of trails remain open to stock is truly vital not just to stock users, but to all users of ONP.

I think ONP needs to put more emphasis into maintaining trails to stock standards since pack animals are the best way to transport materials throughout the park. They create very little impact on the land, do not scare wildlife and can carry 3 or more times as much per animal as any human. Without stock (primarily the ONP pack string) this park would cease to function as Roosevelt intended it to.

I think that ONP needs to put more emphasis in properly maintaining all the historic structures that are spread around the park and perhaps even rebuilding those that have been torn down. The history of the area and the chance to stand in a building that others stood in so many years ago are part of the draw of ONP. Think of how many visitors go up the Elwha just to see Humes Ranch cabin or Michael's cabin. Structures are a draw to people. They are a tangible link to the past and removing so many of them has left a huge hole in the history of ONP.

A few other things I would like to see are better sanitation facilities (outhouses) be created at some of the camp sites that are very well used so that areas are not littered with toilet paper. I would like to see fishing be brought back so that folks can go out and experience the thrill of catching and cooking their own dinner. I would like to see Hurricane Ridge Road be open almost every day throughout the winter.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments on the ONP plan. I look forward to ONP hopefully having a few more public comment periods as the planning team goes through and pulls elements together. ONP is an amazing place and I think that it is being managed in such a way that the character of the park is being well-protected, thus I feel that Alternative A is the best choice for our park as the other Alternatives restrict the use of ONP and don't seem to go along with the reason the park was created in the first place, for the people to enjoy the amazing beauty of our area.

Correspondence ID:	1007	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Topic Question 1:				

No. As a hiker/backpacker the only option is to keep the status quo (option A) or face more restrictions. With the proposed options available, I would have to choose option A as my preferred option.

Topic Question 2:

While I favor protecting wilderness, the increased restrictions on recreational versus the increased protections offered under options B, C and D leave me with little to like about the proposal.

Topic Question 3:

I don't have specific changes I wish to comment on at this time other than to say that this proposal offers to leave things the way they are or restrict future use.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 1008 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,17,2014 23:56:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No it is not. There are too many restrictions on hikers and backpackers. Mandating use of blue bags in all places above 3500' is too restrictive. Mandating use of bear canisters everywhere in the park is too restrictive. Lack of attention to historical structures is disappointing. Reducing trails is a "feature" of Alternative B and likely in C and D.

I do not see convenient registration options for hiking and backpacking. Not everyone has internet access. How does one register after hours. I would like the option to self register if possible. At the trailhead ideally but at least at the park offices after hours.

Topic Question 2:

I understand that in the most heavily used areas there may be a need to require blue bags, bear canisters, and to limit visitation. But across the park? I seriously disagree with this.

Topic Question 3:

Include an alternative that does not reduce use of those areas of the park that are not seeing serious overuse. If registration must be more prevalent make it easier for people to comply.

Comments: First of all, before drastic changes are implemented that will reduce visitation, a strong case should be presented. I do not see that in Alternatives B, C, and D. There is no alternative that would increase trails. That should at least have been on alternative. I do not want the park to become so difficult to visit that I no longer can.

Requiring backpackers to carry bear canisters on less used trips of longer duration is not practical. Requiring a week long trip to pack all food in the canister and also haul out all human waste will not leave room for much else. Again, there may well be areas where the canisters are needed. The blue bags are definitely needed on glaciers. Requiring both throughout the park has not been shown to be necessary from what I have seen published.

Correspondence ID: 1009 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Fax

Correspondence: I support fully and completely what the wilderness society has proposed to you in relation to planning for the park. however, I do not support prescribed burning, new roads or trails, trapping or hunting or use of herbicides or pesticides. the mauling of our national land is abhorrent. While alternatives B and C would be an improvement over the current policy, Wilderness Watch believes Alternative B is the only option that meets the purpose of the Wilderness Act, minimizes human impacts, and preserves solitude and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (i.e. a wilderness experience), however to fully protect the Olympic Wilderness Alternative B should be modified to emphasize that natural processes will be allowed to operate unimpeded, and that restoration activities (except minor, site-specific restoration such as trail damage or campsite removal) will be conducted by natural processes with a minimum of human control.

Correspondence ID: 1010 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: We the undersigned vote for the

ALTERNATIVE C,

which would "emphasize protecting natural resources through ecosystem restoration, including the removal of non-native species."

Correspondence ID: 1011 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum,

This letter is a response to the ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

In the 1880's the national park system was created for the enjoyment of every one. I am one of the many who has explored, enjoyed and experienced the beauty, the solitude, and nature of the parks. Decreasing the human footprint does not lead to the enjoyment of every one.

As the years go by in my life being able to enjoy the park is of great importance. Keeping the roads repaired so one can reach the interior hiking trails, being able to spend a week in the wilderness area with the help of llamas, being able to cross streams and rivers safely, are just a few of the items, I feel, are important.

Keeping wolves and goats out and protecting the native wildlife is a priority. Letting natural fires burn without suppression could be disastrous.

I realize putting together a master plan for ONP will be a fine line to walk and everyone cannot be pleased. My thoughts and prayers are with you as decisions are made. The park is to be enjoyed, not destroyed or locked up.

Correspondence ID: 1012 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Clallam County Dept. of Community Development County Government
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum:

I am in support of Alternative Plan A, for management of the Olympic Wilderness, as it relates to the National Park Service.

I would also like to see the Enchanted Valley chalet moved safely away from the river to preserve our cultural history in what is now known as Olympic National Park.

My father's family arrived here in 1914, with the building of the Chicago Milwaukee Railroad from Port Angeles to Port Townsend, and my mother's family arrived ten years later, in 1924.

Please register my comments accordingly.

Correspondence ID: 1013 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Supt. Creachbaum:

I read that you are accepting comments on the Wilderness Plan.

I hope that no major changes are planned for our Park.

I am a docent at the Museum at the Carnegie and so many who come to Port Angeles to visit ONP have the same thoughts.

They come here because the Park is wild and they want to walk the nature trails as they are now.

People say they don't want the noise, paved trails and RVs that you see at Yellowstone or Yosemite.

I wish more could see it as it is now. Don't change anything.

Correspondence ID:	1014	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Comments on Wilderness Stewardship Plan				

First of all, I am glad that ONP is largely protected as wilderness and that the Park Service is addressing what that protections should look like.

I think the plan needs to be mindful of how citizens will view and support a wilderness plan in an age of increasing recognition that humans have impacted the landscape and that people will support the protection of nature on a reasonable scale. Protection of nature requires that humans advocate for it.

I would like to address your three questions in the reverse order.

1. Specific Elements to Change

I would encourage the idea of a wider distribution of backcountry users by maintaining current trails with their bridges and foot logs and opening up abandoned trails, such as Tshletshy Creek trail. This would spread people out more, reducing the impact on more popular areas. It could also increase support for a wilderness plan that is more friendly to the visitor than Alternatives B, C, and D.

2. What I Like

A. I like the idea of restoration as proposed in Alternative C. It recognizes the human impacts we have seen here. Removing exotics, re-introduction of wolves and other species should be considered.

B. I like careful protection of this wilderness, including no new structures, but maintaining cultural resources, trails and reasonable travel measures like bridges and foot logs. (C.)

C. I prefer protection of cultural resources to the extent practicable. (D.)

3. Significant Range of Alternatives?

I do not feel the plans offer enough alternative. There is too much emphasis on restricting visitation. Rather, I would create a plan with more reasonable visitation opportunity by encouraging a wider visitor distribution throughout the wilderness.

Also, it seems there is too much regulation that has questionable value:

Human waste bags?

Day quotas throughout the wilderness?

Pack goats?

Thank you for the opportunity. I have hiked the Park for 60 years and while I have often traveled off trail, I hope the trail system can be maintained and enhanced.

Correspondence ID: 1015 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachman:

I am a fan of wilderness and its preservation and have enjoyed frequent use of Olympic National park for the past 16 years. That said, the proposed wilderness stewardship plan has too many troublesome options.

Those of us who enjoy spontaneous ready access are appalled that ONP management would consider restricting day use. Wilderness is not enjoyed at a distance - access and immersion are necessary. The existing trails, bridges, and foot-logs should be maintained. Recently abandoned trails should be restored. Day-use quotas and trail abandonment would deny access and destroy a significant constituency.

Human waste bags are a low yield innovation and an enforcement disaster. Intelligently located composting privies are one alternative. The absence of such at heavily used Lake Angeles asserts that said intelligence has not been brought to bear.

Removal of exotic species is a worthy goal. The experience with burros in Grand Canyon and Bandelier and with goats in ONP suggests it will remain unrealized.

I like wolves, but their reintroduction would be a mistake, far too costly in both money and local good will. (I lived in Yellowstone NP 1980-1984 during the run-up to wolf reintroduction. If you question the scale of the effort, do consult with Bob Barbee, the YNP superintendent at the time. He is retired in Bozeman.) Please use ONP's assets where they would produce more value.

Thanks for your attention and best wishes for your Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

Correspondence ID: 1016 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: My comment on preliminary alternatives for Olympic National Park's first Wilderness Stewardship Plan is on Alternative D. Use and recreation to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences.

Hang Gliding from Hurricane could be done at a number of safe launch points on Hurricane Ridge. I have flown hang gliders since 1977 and in many sites across the USA. And I doubt there is a place to hang glide more spectacular in the world!

Requirements for a launch site is a steep hill or cliff with no trees or obstacles in front of launch. About a 50' wide opening on the hill or ridge. There are places on Hurricane Ridge where not a single tree, rock, or anything would be disturbed to use as a launch site. Environmental damage would be insignificant compared to ski lifts and other activities.

Yes you can hang glide in National Parks! Yosemite has allowed hang gliding for years.

I know of no other group so environmentally concerned and respectful of the land as the hang gliding community.

I am certain a flying site on Hurricane Ridge would become a world known hang gliding site. Bringing pilots and families with money from everywhere.

Correspondence ID: 1017 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: 1. Yes

2. Alternative A is all that is needed I feel the park is doing a great job now and need no changes

3. see attached note

4. Blank

Attached Note:

I don't agree with your plan to let fires go. The park was set aside to be saved and protected for future generations. If we had not had passed park policies to suppress fires we would not have a park like we have now.

With climate change, we will see warmer and drier years. Just a matter of time until we have a major fire. It would take hundreds of years to have the jewel of a park we have now, if ever. You are concerned about man's footprint in the wilderness, a fire takes it all.

As for not using motorized equipment in the wilderness, it is not practical or cost efficient to not use chain saws to clear trails, which is done a lot by volunteers. I have never heard a chain saw in the wilderness except when I volunteered on trails myself. Trails are mostly cleared early in the year before most people are hiking.

As for wolf's, look at Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho.

Correspondence ID: 1018 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum,

I was born in Port Angeles 71 years ago and have lived here all my life. Since 1948 I've been a summer resident of the Park (Lake Crescent) and have enjoyed many other areas of the Park as well. What I'm seeing over time is the Park's slow but constant eroding of the public's ability to access and enjoy their Park. With that thought, I offer the following comments:

VISITOR USE AND EXPERIENCE: Not all visitors are seeking this extreme "wilderness experience". Only a small percentage get more than three miles from a trailhead. This extreme "wilderness experience" is already available to those hardy enough. Perhaps more concern should be towards keeping current, already existing, facilities open and available and providing the mobility impaired with more opportunities to enjoy their Park.

Permits: Leave the permit system the way it is. Not everyone has a computer nor can make plans way in advance. making permits more confusing and harder to get is an example of discouraging use of the Park.

Human waste bags: Give me a break!

Campfires: Campfires are as much a part of a fun camping experience as a glass of wine is to a nice dining experience. Beach camping along the coast begs for a campfire and the fuel for these is constantly being replenished. Campfires should remain a part of camping below 3500 feet.

Signage/Route markings: Very important to maintain and improve. This will equate to less people being lost and

requiring SAR activity.

Hiking Trails/Access: Maintain the trail miles and trailheads you have. Continue to allow motorized tools for the maintenance of trails and facilities. Even the most altruistic lovers of a total wilderness experience use their gas guzzlers to get there, their chainsaws to cut their firewood, etc. And as the Park is so obsessed with safety, maintain/replace bridges and water crossings to be safe. This has to help protect natural resources and reduce SAR activity.

The Park constantly reminds us that they are responsible for a large, if not the largest, part of the economy on the Peninsula. Many aspects of these wilderness alternatives will serve only to discourage tourist visitation, negatively impacting our economy.

Correspondence ID: 1019 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Forks Chamber of Commerce Town or City Government
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: The Olympic National Park General Management Plan represents a commitment by the National Park Service to the public on how the Park will be managed for the next 15-20 years. The policy on visitor use and experience states Park resources are conserved unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

The Forks Chamber of Commerce supports an alternative which enhances tourism. We recommend you expand Alternative D by complying with existing policy which is identified above. Specifically Alternative D should clearly provide for access.

We appreciate our relationship with the Olympic National Park and look forward to discussing this issue further.

We are sending this to our chamber membership, along with the link <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/olymwild> to encourage them to voice their opinions and recommendations.

Correspondence ID: 1020 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

I am a lifelong, northwest hiker and climber, and presently reside in Seattle and I am a practicing physician there. I actively use the trails as well as travel cross country in the Olympic National Park. I have visited by foot most areas in the park and have done several traverses, including the Baileys. My understanding is a new multiuse plan is being implemented in your park.

My concern is, that with a decreasing budget and an increasing sense that Olympic National park is leaning toward implementing a plan with less trail access, that over the long term, backcountry access will decrease.

My sense is that with the trail system as it stands right now, the available wilderness for ecosystem preservation as well as primitive travel is vast and adequate for both these stated likely goals of the NPS. An attitude where less trails are maintained and present, with less access therein, and resulting more pure wilderness with the plans as outlined, is worrisome in my opinion.

The trail system has substantially dwindled in the 40 years I have traveled in Olympic National Park. Any further reduction in trails will continue to hamper the ability of backcountry travelers to access the wilderness. I must ask the question, is this best for the park?? A well maintained, extensive trail network in this age of tight schedules and busy citizens is essential or I worry Park usage, green bonding and public support for our best Washington Park could wane. Maybe not in my lifetime but very likely my children's.

I really hope you seriously consider the long term actions and ramification of this impending action prior to implementation. As not only a mountain traveler, but a medical doctor, I can think of no better healthy activity for mind, body and soul than backpacking or day hiking in our wild places, and strongly hope these activities are encouraged rather than discouraged by your agency.

Correspondence ID: 1021 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,16,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing concerning Olympic National Park's Wilderness Stewardship Plan. Many people I have been discussing this issue with and I have always been of the belief that our country's national parks are set aside for the enjoyment of the people. It seems to me that creating more wilderness area in Olympic National Park is restricting the use of this beautiful park by the majority of people, thus reducing the number of visitors coming to our area to enjoy the park. I am certainly in favor of some areas being set aside for wilderness preservation, but this park is SO HUGE, there is ample acreage for wilderness and ample acreage for human enjoyment without creating more wilderness.

If I were to choose from the alternatives that have been presented, I would probably choose D along with A.

On a slightly different note, since moving to Port Angeles in 1968, I have noticed that visiting ONP is not as enjoyable as it used to be. It is now more restrictive, expensive, and the philosophy of the park's mission has become overly influenced by staunch environmentalists. It's disappointing. It would be nice to get back to a more user friendly relationship.

Correspondence ID: 1022 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: National Outdoor Leadership School Non-Governmental
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,19,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

Olympic National Park deserves strong stewardship to guarantee future generations access to its rich biological diversity. The National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS) applauds the Park for creating Preliminary Draft Alternatives for a new Wilderness Management Plan with a careful eye toward public input and the current and anticipated demands on Wilderness. We appreciate the energy spent on creating the three current preliminary draft alternatives and the opportunity to provide comments on them.

Founded in 1965, NOLS has been using the Wilderness classroom for almost as long as the designation has existed. We've been a Commercial Use Authorization (CUA) holder in Olympic National Park for almost thirty years. From NOLS Pacific Northwest, we lead extended backpacking, mountaineering, climbing, sea kayaking and sailing expeditions across two states and into British Columbia. Core to a NOLS education are environmental studies, land management and Wilderness designation understanding, as well as the development of a wilderness ethic. Support for Wilderness has always been a tenet of NOLS. We have been on the leading edge in developing camping techniques that reduce human impacts to Wilderness resources in turn allowing more people to access Wilderness while reducing cumulative impacts to the land and to each other.

Olympic National Park has clearly been deliberate in considering the clear need for oversight and management to provide proper stewardship of these sensitive ecosystems. Thank you for your work thus far. There is an inherent tension between protecting wilderness character and promoting opportunities for education and recreation of the public. The Park has been thoughtful in seeking balance between these competing values.

Given the preliminary draft alternatives presented, NOLS has concerns that an adequate range of management approaches have not been presented. All preliminary draft alternatives, with the exception of the No Action alternative, restrict access to both the public and organized groups. We encourage the Park to develop an alternative

that considers increased use, and the impacts of that use, to ensure an adequate range of management approaches.

Language within draft alternative B restricting commercial use within Wilderness to only groups serving the mobility impaired is of particular concern. While this strategy may not find its way into the preferred alternative, it gives no consideration to other commercial activities that are consistent with the Wilderness Act. More generally, there does not appear to be a preliminary draft alternative that sufficiently supports education of the next generation of conservationists and public land advocates.

Nationwide, Wilderness use is on the decline. To ensure a thriving public lands system 50 years from now, it is vital that the public, and specifically youth, are provided reasonable access to wild public lands. This happens through access for the public, engaging Park-provided programming, and commercial and special use access. With its proximity to large urban areas, Olympic National Park is uniquely positioned to influence and provide transformative outdoor experiences to a broad cross-section of society. This can only come through appropriate access and regulation.

To effectively balance many competing priorities we believe a new draft alternative should include the following considerations:

- Maintaining a group size limit of 12.
- Supporting education-oriented commercial use within Wilderness.
- Providing adequate funding and/or tools to maintain current trail access (e.g. either increasing funding for non-mechanized trail maintenance or continuing the use of mechanized tree removal across trails).
- Allowing for off-trail travel.
- Maintaining a role for responsible stock usage within the Park.
- Providing opportunities for additional tools/resources for the public and groups to protect the ecosystem (e.g. more options beyond bear canisters).
- Establishing a regulatory system that appropriately manages the resource while allowing for public and commercial groups to gain permits without unnecessary logistical challenge (e.g. movement towards a web-based system).
- Implementing a human waste bag requirement above 3500 feet.
- Providing clear opportunities for service - especially for CUA groups.

We appreciate the challenge of managing the two priorities of wilderness protection and public access for recreation and education. As a founder of Leave No Trace and a longstanding permit holder and steward of public lands, we feel well positioned to help Olympic National Park draft an effective new Wilderness Management Plan. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to provide input in this important process. We look forward to continued dialogue and work on this plan.

Correspondence ID:	1023	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms. Creachbaum:				

This letter contains my comments on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) which I would like included as part of the official comment record. I am writing to you as a former founding member of FONP (currently resigned due to ONP policies) and an active hiker, climber and skier that logs hundreds of miles each year in the park and national forest.

This may seem rather harsh but none of the four alternatives presented in the WSP draft documents are acceptable. While the do nothing alternative is the least harmful even it is not acceptable. The steady creep of overly zealous management by ONP staff has gradually encroached on the original intent of Congress in its deliberations authorizing the park. When ONP was established by Congress by P.L. 75-778 on June 29, 1938 (52 Stat.1241) the Park Purpose states "in order to...preserve for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the people, the finest example of primeval forests...; to provide suitable winter range...; to conserve and to render available to the people, for recreational use, this outstanding mountainous country,... together with a narrow strip along the beautiful Washington coast." The Wilderness Act of 1964 was not intended to erode or conflict with the 1938 ONP

authorizing legislation.

The combined result is that over the years there has been a steady reduction of ONP lands available to the public for recreational use. Some examples are premature seasonal closures such as occurred last fall for the Obstruction Point area, closure of the Happy Lake Ridge and Boulder Lake trails under the guise of safety, the continued inaccessibility of the Dosewallips campground under the guise of road issues, regular closure of the Hurricane Ridge road due to exaggerated weather conditions. The road into La Poel campground along Lake Crescent has been closed for over a year due to lack of funding. Are these legitimate reasons or is it a matter of management choice on where existing funds are allocated? I could go on with this list but it will only further reinforce the fact that that ONP continues to restrict access thereby violating one of the key tenants of the Park Purpose stated in P.L. 75-778, that is "available to the people for recreational use."

Restriction of access is an elitist notion that appeals to those few that want to enjoy a private preserve in our environment without being bothered by the general public that may not share their altruistic idea of wilderness. The general public majority should not be discriminated against by reinforcing this elitist approach.

Improved ONP public access and more visitor friendly policies are extremely important to our local economy. Every year our federal government publishes by county all FICA wages earned, tracking the total wages paid for both public and private employment. This total has been declining for the past 10 years which has had a strong negative impact on our communities. ONP tracks visitations by using highway vehicle counters and from this calculates local economic impact; the numbers reported do not square with other data showing our declining economy. ONP could have a positive impact by providing an environment that encourages tourism and Park visitations.

The statesman like way to address my concerns and those of many others in our community is to throw out all four alternatives and start over with a simple plan that recognizes the vast majority of the Park, 95%, s wilderness, inaccessible except for the hardest adventurers. It is already preserved through its geography; no further action is needed. This requires a fresh approach starting from scratch. In addition I urge you to undertake a thorough review of current ONP policies making revisions where necessary to encourage more public access. This approach takes courage but it will be well received in our community and others adjacent to the Park.

Correspondence ID: 1024 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,19,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum,

We submit our letter with complete support of the well written letter by Mr. Richard Kott. He is an informed and well respected man who has traveled many miles and many places in our beautiful Olympic National Park. His knowledge is so very important and must be considered in your decision. I am third generation of private property ownership on Lake Crescent, my Grandfather built the current Log Cabin Resort; our 6 year old great nephew will be in the 5th generation of our family to have use and enjoyment of private property inside ONP - in our opinion we are the best stewards the Park could ever have and you need to listen to us.

Correspondence ID: 1025 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Affiliation:

Received: May,19,2014 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: 1. No, B, C, D take away from visitor enjoyment and accessibility Alternative A is best approach as it has been perfected thru the years.

2. Nothing. They are all designed to take away from the visitor experience and do nothing to enhance wilderness.

3. No bear cans. Experienced hikers know how to keep food safe from bears in the Olympics. Keep bear wires where needed In remote areas of the park (Bailey Range, Skyline, etc) bears run from hikers 90% of the time. The other 1% ignore them, In congregated areas, esp. where park personnel stay, bears are attracted to the odor of pack

in meats (bacon, etc.) In 25,000 miles of hiking in the Olympics I've never had a bear encounter over food.

4. See attached [as written below]

Do not change primitive trails to way trails. Good trails eliminate trampling of surrounding wilderness. I've hiked in over 60 countries - New Zealand, Nepal, Indonesia, Europe etc. There's nothing like the Olympic trail system. Too many trails have been abandoned by the park

The chain saw should remain a primary tool. Tests by park crews show that chain saws out-perform crosscut saws 3 to 1. Most volunteers crews rely on chain saws. Chain saws are also an efficient brushing tool. Brush grows in the rain forest like nowhere else. Crosscut saws are a waste of limited taxpayer money

Retain and add footlogs for hiker safety and accessibility. Replace footlog on N. Fork Solduc River that was washed out several years ago. The ford here is dangerous during spring and early summer run-off and other high water making access to 8 miles of beautiful forest and trail difficult, A footlog was in place here for over 70 years!

Retain all historical structures in the park. Most are gone. Enchanted Valley Chalet is unique to this world.

No limits on dayhikes in the Olympics.

Continue to allow beach fires.

Eliminate no fire zone on Aurora Ridge as it sees little use and there's more than plenty of wood.

True wilderness is free. Eliminate fees for backpackers. None of this money goes to trail maintenance as the Superintendent at the time said it would.

No pack out of human waste. It is biodegradable. Bury it. Continue out door privy's as has been done for 80 years.

When you look at a map of ONP one might think it looks small, but it's quite the opposite. With 95% considered wilderness there is a tremendous amount out there. We don't need more rules and limits.

Correspondence ID:	1026	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,19,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms. Creachbaum;				

This letter is in regard to ONP Wilderness Stewardship Plan. As senior hikers who love hiking the High Divide, Elwha, Hoh, Enchanted Valley, Bolder Lake, Aurora Ridge, Pyramid Peak, Solduc and many other trails in ONP, it has become more difficult to enjoy the backcountry. The increasing loss of trails and bridges makes usage far more hazardous and in some spots the designated trail is impassable.

The Park was established in 1938 for the use and enjoyment of the people. The park inherited a wonderful trail system including bridges and shelters. These were built by the CCC with the help of stock (horses, mules, etc.) which were used to pack equipment and provisions as they continue to do so today. It is quite evident that this inheritance has not been maintained. Losing over 230 miles of trails, hundreds, of historic structure's and many bridge crossing is totally unacceptable. For all of those who use the Park, including future generations, we need to maintain and improve what we have and not restrict our use of the backcountry.

The current plan A, while not totally acceptable, would be the best option. Plans B, C, and D are too restrictive, making it much harder for people to enjoy a backcountry experience.

Correspondence ID:	1027	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				

Affiliation:**Received:** May,19,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

After reviewing the draft Wilderness Plan and attending the local scoping meeting held in Port Angeles, I have come to the conclusion that only Alternative A (no-action) would be of any benefit to myself and visitors. I feel that the plan completely ignores the whole purpose for which Olympic National Park was created. Instead, extremely restrictive measures are outlined in plans B, C, and D. Elements such as: eliminating all coastal campfires, instituting park-wide quotas and abandoning more of an already shrinking trail system are some of the most significant issues I have with this draft proposal.

Going to the beach and having a campfire is part of a Wilderness experience I and countless other campers enjoy every year. There is simply no logical reason for taking this experience away, as anyone who has hiked the coast has noted the abundance of driftwood available for these fires. If this were imposed, going camping at the coast would never be the same.

As for quotas, ONP has already instituted these in the most heavily visited areas, and more of them should only be added if deemed completely necessary. Self-registration should remain available in non-quota areas for hiker convenience. Day quotas are completely unnecessary and would be an unexpected burden on visitors.

One of the most unique features of Olympic is the fact that the only way to visit the majority of the Park is by using the trail system. Under this plan, a significant amount of that system would be abandoned. As an avid hiker/backpacker myself, I don't expect to see new trails constructed. I would, however, expect every effort to be made towards preserving these existing trails. The draft proposal should focus more on ways to preserve them for the future, not eliminating them.

Lastly, I would like to take issue with the abandonment with historic structures. These homesteads and shelters are part of the history that made Olympic National Park what it is today. They tell a story of those who defied the odds and dared to venture deep into the unexplored reaches of this vast Wilderness. As I read this draft, history has no place in Olympic National Park and the only historical artifacts for "future generations" will be piles of rotten logs.

Long before Olympic National Park was created, people came to recreate in the grandeur of the Olympic Mountains; never could they have imagined that in the future such restrictive elements would be implemented and that the most basic things, such as having a campfire, would be forbidden. They went off a promise that was reflected in the acting legislation that created Olympic National Park. It was simple - "preserve for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the people." I would hope that you would keep that promise!

Correspondence ID: 1028 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** May,19,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** We appreciate the opportunity to comment on Preliminary Draft Alternatives for the ONP Wilderness Stewardship. The Park was one of the attractions prompting us to decide in 1971 to make Port Angeles our home for the rest of our lives. We want to make sure the Park will continue to protect the qualities that make it our area's prime contributor to the economy as well as quality of life.

We also are appreciative of the knowledge, dedication and time represented in recommendations you have received from Olympic Park Associates and support many of them, including:

*Carrying capacities and quotas will be set for high-use areas.

*Trail-less wilderness will be retained.

*Visitor use will be managed to reduce impacts on native species.

*Exotic plants and animals will be eliminated or controlled.

*A restoration plan/EIS for the gray wolf will be developed.

*Stock use will be regulated and confined to designated trails.

*No new radio or transmission towers will be installed.

*Wilderness education will accompany all permits.

Although we believe great care must be exercised in creating new trails, we are not ready to say that no new trails should be created. In some circumstances it could be more protective to provide trails rather than have hikers wear down areas on their own.

We agree with fine-tuning some recommendations, including attempting to recover and restore threatened, endangered and at-risk species rather than simply monitoring them.

We hope the Park will extend the kind of effort being made to restore habitat in the riparian area of the Elwha River by doing everything it can to contribute to the well-being of all the species that exist in the Park but also depend on habitat beyond it. For example, Ennis Creek and numerous other streams originate in the Park but extend beyond its boundaries. It seems meaningless to protect salmonids within the Park and then take no responsibility for what happens to them outside the Park. In reading historical materials about Olympic national Park, we have been impressed by the superintendents who took this broader view. Making sure we don't continue to lose fish populations is going to require collaboration among many different entities.

We believe Alternative B contains good management principles regarding historic structures in wilderness, quotas and use limits, as well as sensitivity about use of aircraft, which can disrupt the wilderness experience.

We also think Alternative C has good recommendations for the ecosystem, including wilderness trail and campsite zoning, trail and bridge management, stock use, and campfire restrictions.

Alternative D, adding wilderness experiences while protecting the ecosystem, seems sensible, especially in interpretive hikes, tribal access to ethnographic resources, and some trail zone elements.

Specific recommendations drawn from each of these alternatives follow.

We support OPA in its determination that Alternative C presents the best strategy for preserving diverse natural species and environments while identifying heavily used nature trails (zone 1); maintaining popular access trails up river valleys and major passes (zones 2 and 3); delineating primitive trails (zone 4) and way trails (zone 5); and regulating camping in fragile, alpine and less-heavily used environments. OPA's approval of some trail maintenance in zone 4 and its request for clarifications regarding specific areas also makes sense to use.

OPA's support for "specific trail zone elements from other alternative that would increase resource protection yet allow for a modest increase of compatible use on some trails" also fits with our desire for balancing the need for protection with that of enabling more people to experience the wilderness.

We also endorse OPA's statements regarding historic structures, scientific research, park operations, fire, campsites and commercial services, animal-proof canisters, waste management, accessible and interpretive trails in front country, and a wilderness district.

We commend your encouragement of public comments but hope we can have confidence in the final plan being more grounded in scientific findings than local politics, which has a history of being short-sighted and lacking sufficient sensitivity to the importance of preserving species.

Correspondence ID:	1029	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,19,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Sarah,				

Please include my following comments as part of the official comment record for the Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

I have carefully studied over the preliminary draft alternatives (A-D) and have decided that Alternative A - no action, the continuation of existing management practices - is the alternative that will be in the best interest of ONP users.

I do understand the Wilderness Act of 1964 and its impact on the management of ONP. I also know that when ONP was established in 1938 as a national park it was to be used by the people. To be preserved for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the people and not just be locked up for the majority who would no longer have access because of changes in trail use, over all back country use and other restrictions that the preliminary draft Alternatives B, C, and D include.

There are no better "Stewards" of this wonderful national park than the people that live here and the visitors that come to be a part of this extraordinary place we call Olympic National Park.

Correspondence ID:	1030	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,20,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				

Correspondence: We have been neighbors of ONP just short of three quarters of a century. During that time we have enjoyed the many opportunities to explore, hike, camp, fish, and observe the wild life. We would like to be able to do so without any additional restrictions.

When the Park was established in 1938 the enabling legislation assured citizens that they would be able to enjoy the Park as they always had. As the years went by, actions by the Park have reduced the ability to do this. The Wilderness Act of 1964 was not intended to compromise or change the authorizing legislation.

No further restrictions need to be introduced to affect the public's ability to enjoy the Park. We do not agree with B, C, or D Alternatives and believe Alternative A, although not perfect, should suffice to allow visitors to enjoy the Park as originally intended, as well as preserving the wilderness.

However, we think consideration should be made to create a plan that, while recognizing that 90% of Olympic National Park IS in wilderness and reserved for the hearty souls, would address the needs of ALL the other individuals and groups that want to hike with the assurance of shelters and safe trails; campgrounds for those in RV's as well as tents; fishing, with some areas allowing catch and keep and boating, including motor boats on lowland lakes.

It is frustrating that these issues have to continually be addressed time and time again. Surely a permanent plan, keeping with the original intent of the creation of this park, could be implemented and followed.

Correspondence ID:	1031	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Olympic Peninsula Visitor Bureau Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

The Olympic Peninsula Visitor Bureau, the tourism marketing entity representing unincorporated Clallam County, wishes to give input in regards to the Wilderness Stewardship Plan being considered for updates at this time.

Olympic National Park is the number 1 reason our visitors come to the Olympic Peninsula. This World Heritage Site impacts the surrounding counties in a big way, as you know, with the National Parks impact studies and with those of the State's Dean Runyon show that tourism is a key part of the economies of all 4 counties surrounding the Park.

We understand that the Wilderness Stewardship plan is only addressing those regions in the park that are wilderness, and not roads, campgrounds and visitor centers in the Park. There are several things we would like to be considered

as you move forward in crafting policies for the future:

1. Communications are happening differently than they have in the past. Social media, digital communications and mobile applications are becoming more the norm. People are trying to do more in less time, and often try to do as much as they can before they leave home. This is especially true for younger generations. We urge ONP to work to accommodate these changing lifestyles in order to continue to engage visitors and not discourage them. One way to do this may be allowing permits to be obtained in advance via a website. We understand that inspiring stewardship via web-based communications can present challenges, but believe ONP can be a leader in this arena with interactive checklists or information.

2. Work with local communities to establish permitting sites and places to pick up food canisters.

3. Keep all existing trails open. We do not want to lose trails in the Park. Though they may be less traveled, it is important to have those 'roads less travelled' to offer visitors. Many will take the popular trails and enjoy them in their first visit. But as they learn to love the wilderness, they may choose those less traveled areas to explore. Having those options is important to growing the return visits to the park.

4. Keep trails open to stock at current levels. Travelling with stock allows people with reduced mobility to reach wilderness areas. Stock can also be a great friend to the Park, and maintaining that relationship is important to ONP.

We appreciate this opportunity to give input for this important process.

Correspondence ID:	1032	Project:	29224	Document:	58015	Private:	Y
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual						
Affiliation:							
Received:	May,19,2014 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						

Correspondence: I submit these comments for the purpose of "Preliminary Draft Alternatives" to the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for Olympic National Park, submitted with the intent of meeting the 17May2014 deadline and creating standing for myself in this process. Please note as per public disclosure (318 Department Manual 4 App.2.11), I request that this information not be released. I further request my name and/or address not be released. I am an individual and no attempt is made to represent any organization or business, whether ad hoc or formally.

I. Preliminary Draft Alternatives workshops/public meetings.

a. Meeting did not provide details such as:

i. Explaining the difference/purpose of the two files: from PEPC download site

1. Current_Trail_Classes_V2

2. Wilderness_TrailClasses_20141

ii. What are the definitions/intent for the different classes, where is the concise and explanatory language for such classifications? Who designated the Norwegian Memorial Trail (Allens Bay, Lake Ozette) as a way trail, when did that designation take place, when was there any public involvement/input in to that designation? This designation is in error, this is a NPS designated trail, at least through any public processes/mapping. The Table's term is so ambiguous when it comes to the fact this trail just hasn't been maintained by the Park, the Park chose NOT to maintain it versus some form of a trail created by the "disrespectful act" of the public. So to apply maintain it any further is subject to the purpose of resource protection only if/as determined by minimum requirement analysis is a failure of the Park to uphold its mandated purpose. I can use wiffle words just as much as this game of a plan creates in its language. My bottom line is stop stealing my Park, this plan is stealing and denying my rights that I have under the Constitution and those that I have earned for my service to my country.

iii. The maps have removed the third access point for Lake Ozette, Rayonier Landing off the Hoki-Ozette Road. This was addressed during the ONP GMP and to take such action to "remove" it during this process is just another example of the planning process acting in a discriminatory manner, at least misrepresentative. I draw attention to the Congressional intent of the Park's expansion legislation that access to the lake shall be maintained.

iv. The alternatives' maps:

1. What in the world is the designation for the Erikson Bay (Lake Ozette) camping area/head of the bay designated as a Zone 2 trail? Why would you pick this area for such designation and not do the same for every other place in the wilderness? WHY?
2. The designations and zoning purposes for South Sand Point Trail is bad. This is not only a valuable access trail for the coast it is also a historic trail that has great examples of puncheon and the defense of the country. The plan promotes the rotting of such values.

II. Poster_-_Items_to_Note_(Other_Features_of_Value).pdf: from PEPC download

- a. Wilderness Act section 2(c) speaks of "...historical value."
- b. In the poster it states: It has been determined that the only features within the Olympic Wilderness that will be addressed within the "Other Features of Value" quality of wilderness character are Native American resources (i.e., archeological resources, traditional cultural properties, and ethnographic resources.)
- c. Who, where, how was this determination made to limit the characteristics to only what is stated? It is visibly biased and discriminatory; it violates the Constitution's equal protection rights. For one, it completely discounts the historical values created by the homestead and shipwreck era as if they did not exist. It creates an assumption that human impact to this area can therefore only be a product of the citizens of the United States and not "other living organisms". Other Features of Value fall way short of being truthful and do not live up to the intent of the Wilderness Act for historical values. It also disregards the Park's enabling legislation for those rightful landowners to full use and enjoyment by destroying their history and culture.

III. None of my submitted comments during the scoping process were responded to, let alone incorporated into a considered alternative. Therefore, I oppose all four alternatives and claim a fifth resource alternative is essential, incorporating at a minimum the solutions to those same comments as copied:

1. Monuments in designated wilderness: the plan needs to address the management of designated monuments and cemeteries within the wilderness. Specifically, the caretaking and long term protection of the Norwegian Memorial (Prince Arthur crew gravesites). Other shipwrecks along the coastal strip need to be addressed also, to include how designated memorials will be managed and taken care of.

2. Wilderness trails: Re-establish the Allens Bay-Norwegian Memorial Trail (2.8 miles). It was discussed at the meetings how wilderness values can actually be incorporated in to this trail while at the same time improving significantly access to this region of the coast. Additionally, the coastal strip has an inherent issue of concentrating hiking/backcountry use in select areas. Re-establishing trails such as this would meet a wilderness impact need to spread the use out in a more environmentally manageable way.

3. Cultural Trail and History: Lake Ozette and its adjacent coastline have been involved in significant events this country has faced, i.e. potential for invasion during WWII, the epitome of the homestead era and struggles, traditional land and resource use. Establish a trail that parallels the Ozette River throughout its run; one that would incorporate current historical landmarks, the values of the old growth forest that isn't currently accessible, and the safety/response such a trail would afford being north of the mouth of the river (currently requiring fording during periods of high water if relying solely on beach hiking).

4. The coastal strip wilderness is "downriver" from both non-wilderness Park and the State of Washington. This creates a conflict with current administrative rules in practice when addressing impacts to those areas "upstream". The norm for wilderness designated areas and the original wilderness act has the tendency to set aside for protection areas in the headwaters/upstream of frontcountry and other resources uses. The conflict created has not been addressed in the legislative designations. I advocate suggested language be included in the plan that will address these conflicts, for both the purpose of recommending solutions to Congress and also for administrative/policy directives created within the Department of Interior.

5. Communication about the wilderness: the plan needs to address how the Park's activities will be transmitted to the public and adjacent communities/landowners. Research projects have taken a back seat in communicating those activities, whereas in the past one tool that was available was the IAR process that provided the application, permit, and annual reporting by projects. This isn't available anymore, limited to the possible annual reporting that provides only subjective limited details. The state of the wilderness is a resource that has to be open and discussed; or the wilderness serves no resource purpose.

6. It would really be nice to address how the adjacent communities and landowners to wilderness will be included in the evaluation of non-wilderness areas for possible designation. Wilderness for purpose of being a resource is mostly a single use concept; how well that meshes in to the multi-use needs of the people is dependent on how these same people are included in the evaluation.

IV. Specific areas with emphasis such a plan has to address:

a. Wilderness

Correspondence ID: 1033 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015 **Private:** Y
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,19,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I submit these comments for the purpose of "Preliminary Draft Alternatives" to the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for Olympic National Park, submitted with the intent of meeting the 17May2014 deadline and creating standing for myself in this process. Please note as per public disclosure (318 Department Manual 4 App.2.11), I request that this information not be released. I further request my name and/or address not be released. I am an individual and no attempt is made to represent any organization or business, whether ad hoc or formally.

I. Preliminary Draft Alternatives workshops/public meetings.

a. Meeting did not provide details such as:

i. Explaining the difference/purpose of the two files: from PEPC download site

1. Current_Trail_Classes_V2
2. Wilderness_TrailClasses_20141

ii. What are the definitions/intent for the different classes, where is the concise and explanatory language for such classifications? Who designated the Norwegian Memorial Trail (Allens Bay, Lake Ozette) as a way trail, when did that designation take place, when was there any public involvement/input in to that designation? This designation is in error, this is a NPS designated trail, at least through any public processes/mapping. The Table's term is so ambiguous when it comes to the fact this trail just hasn't been maintained by the Park, the Park chose NOT to maintain it versus some form of a trail created by the "disrespectful act" of the public. So to apply maintain it any further is subject to the purpose of resource protection only if/as determined by minimum requirement analysis is a failure of the Park to uphold its mandated purpose. I can use wiffle words just as much as this game of a plan creates in its language. My bottom line is stop stealing my Park, this plan is stealing and denying my rights that I have under the Constitution and those that I have earned for my service to my country.

iii. The maps have removed the third access point for Lake Ozette, Rayonier Landing off the Hoki-Ozette Road. This was addressed during the ONP GMP and to take such action to "remove" it during this process is just another example of the planning process acting in a discriminatory manner, at least misrepresentative. I draw attention to the Congressional intent of the Park's expansion legislation that access to the lake shall be maintained.

iv. The alternatives' maps:

1. What in the world is the designation for the Erikson Bay (Lake Ozette) camping area/head of the bay designated as a Zone 2 trail? Why would you pick this area for such designation and not do the same for every other place in the wilderness? WHY?
2. The designations and zoning purposes for South Sand Point Trail is bad. This is not only a valuable access trail for the coast it is also a historic trail that has great examples of puncheon and the defense of the country. The plan promotes the rotting of such values.

II. Poster_-_Items_to_Note_(Other_Features_of_Value).pdf: from PEPC download

- a. Wilderness Act section 2(c) speaks of "...historical value."
- b. In the poster it states: It has been determined that the only features within the Olympic Wilderness that will be addressed within the "Other Features of Value" quality of wilderness character are Native American resources (i.e., archeological resources, traditional cultural properties, and ethnographic resources.)
- c. Who, where, how was this determination made to limit the characteristics to only what is stated? It is visably

biased and discriminatory; it violates the Constitution's equal protection rights. For one, it completely discounts the historical values created by the homestead and shipwreck era as if they did not exist. It creates an assumption that human impact to this area can therefore only be a product of the citizens of the United States and not "other living organisms". Other Features of Value fall way short of being truthful and do not live up to the intent of the Wilderness Act for historical values. It also disregards the Park's enabling legislation for those rightful landowners to full use and enjoyment by destroying their history and culture.

III. None of my submitted comments during the scoping process were responded to, let alone incorporated into a considered alternative. Therefore, I oppose all four alternatives and claim a fifth resource alternative is essential, incorporating at a minimum the solutions to those same comments as copied:

1. Monuments in designated wilderness: the plan needs to address the management of designated monuments and cemeteries within the wilderness. Specifically, the caretaking and long term protection of the Norwegian Memorial (Prince Arthur crew gravesites). Other shipwrecks along the coastal strip need to be addressed also, to include how designated memorials will be managed and taken care of.

2. Wilderness trails: Re-establish the Allens Bay-Norwegian Memorial Trail (2.8 miles). It was discussed at the meetings how wilderness values can actually be incorporated in to this trail while at the same time improving significantly access to this region of the coast. Additionally, the coastal strip has an inherent issue of concentrating hiking/backcountry use in select areas. Re-establishing trails such as this would meet a wilderness impact need to spread the use out in a more environmentally manageable way.

3. Cultural Trail and History: Lake Ozette and its adjacent coastline have been involved in significant events this country has faced, i.e. potential for invasion during WWII, the epitome of the homestead era and struggles, traditional land and resource use. Establish a trail that parallels the Ozette River throughout its run; one that would incorporate current historical landmarks, the values of the old growth forest that isn't currently accessible, and the safety/response such a trail would afford being north of the mouth of the river (currently requiring fording during periods of high water if relying solely on beach hiking).

4. The coastal strip wilderness is "downriver" from both non-wilderness Park and the State of Washington. This creates a conflict with current administrative rules in practice when addressing impacts to those areas "upstream". The norm for wilderness designated areas and the original wilderness act has the tendency to set aside for protection areas in the headwaters/upstream of frontcountry and other resources uses. The conflict created has not been addressed in the legislative designations. I advocate suggested language be included in the plan that will address these conflicts, for both the purpose of recommending solutions to Congress and also for administrative/policy directives created within the Department of Interior.

5. Communication about the wilderness: the plan needs to address how the Park's activities will be transmitted to the public and adjacent communities/landowners. Research projects have taken a back seat in communicating those activities, whereas in the past one tool that was available was the IAR process that provided the application, permit, and annual reporting by projects. This isn't available anymore, limited to the possible annual reporting that provides only subjective limited details. The state of the wilderness is a resource that has to be open and discussed; or the wilderness serves no resource purpose.

6. It would really be nice to address how the adjacent communities and landowners to wilderness will be included in the evaluation of non-wilderness areas for possible designation. Wilderness for purpose of being a resource is mostly a single use concept; how well that meshes in to the multi-use needs of the people is dependent on how these same people are included in the evaluation.

IV. Specific areas with emphasis such a plan has to address:

a. Wilderness designation downstream from developed/frontcountry that is creating an impact (flooding) needs a remedy for policy and minimum tool for the taking of property by such non action to date. If the plan cannot solve this, at a minimum, legislative corrective action needs to be analyzed and suggested language; similar to the same principal of considering the wilderness values of non-wilderness segments of the Park for consideration to be incorporated in to wilderness designation.

b. Evaluation of the most current Development Concept Plan for Ozette to determine what actions in the wilderness

area have not been acted upon, or describing what has changed from that position of the Park. Specifically why the shelters were destroyed, in conflict with the decision made in the Development Concept Plan.

c. Show compliance with the Governor's Deed, 28 July 1988, specifying the consulting with the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission on this planning activity, and specifying how/where the plan endeavored in accommodating the State's continual interest.

d. Clear and concise objective of maintaining and protecting the cultural and historical places and monuments within the designated wilderness areas.

I oppose all four draft alternatives: I claim a fifth resource alternative is essential. I'm very disappointed in what has been produced here in the Preliminary Draft Alternatives. It is a waste of time to even ask for scoping comments and now draft alternative comments to just be "spit" upon; that's how I feel this plan's authors have done...but remember I can "spit" back, this is my country, this is my Park. Is that what this plan wants in the citizens it serves, animosity? I believe this plan has created cause for me to feel this way.

Correspondence ID:	1034	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Olympic Peninsula Tourism Commission Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

The Olympic Peninsula Tourism Commission, OPTC, a cooperative marketing group of 13 of ONP's neighboring communities, wishes to thank ONP for the chance to give input in regards to the Wilderness Stewardship Plan being considered for updates at this time.

Olympic National Park is the number 1 reason our visitors come to the Olympic Peninsula. This World Heritage Site impacts the surrounding counties in a big way, as you know, with the National Parks impact studies and with those of the State's Dean Runyon show that tourism is a key part of the economies of all 4 counties surrounding the Park.

We understand that the Wilderness Stewardship plan is only addressing those regions in the park that are wilderness, and not roads, campgrounds and visitor centers in the Park. There are several things we would like to be considered as you move forward in crafting policies for the future:

1. Communications are happening differently than they have in the past. Social media, digital communications and mobile applications are becoming more the norm. People are trying to do more in less time, and often try to do as much as they can before they leave home. This is especially true for younger generations. We urge ONP to work to accommodate these changing lifestyles in order to continue to engage visitors and not discourage them. One way to do this may be allowing permits to be obtained in advance via a website. We understand that inspiring stewardship via web-based communications can present challenges, but believe ONP can be a leader in this arena with interactive checklists or information.

2. Work with local communities to establish permitting sites and places to pick up food canisters.

3. Keep all existing trails open. We do not want to lose trails in the Park. Though they may be less traveled, it is important to have those 'roads less travelled' to offer visitors. Many will take the popular trails and enjoy them in their first visit. But as they learn to love the wilderness, they may choose those less traveled areas to explore. Having those options is important to growing the return visits to the park.

4. Keep trails open to stock at current levels. Travelling with stock allows people with reduced mobility to reach wilderness areas. Stock can also be a great friend to the Park, and maintaining that relationship is important to ONP.

We appreciate this opportunity to give input for this important process.

Correspondence ID:	1035	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					

Received: May,12,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: I agree with everything in the OPA letter, att'd.

Correspondence ID: 1036 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Board of Clallam County Commissioners County Government
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: May,08,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sarah:

Thank you in advance for considering the following comments as you consider updating ONP's back-country management plan, in the fashion styled above.

As you know, visitors to the park number in the millions annually - not all of them in Clallam County of course, but in substantial numbers here. These visitors constitute and contribute to a vital component of our County's economy, namely tourism, and ONP's Wilderness Management Plan must acknowledge that. Specifically, whatever plan is eventually adopted must not create a scheme whereby it becomes harder for visitors to enjoy ONP, and therefore, fewer visitors arrive in our county.

In fact, it would be completely consistent with ONP's enabling legislation at 16 U.S.C. 1 et. seq.; Section 4 of the Wilderness Act (P.L. 88-577 (16 U.S.C. 1133)), and the Washington Park Wilderness Act (P.L. 100-688, 102 STAT. 3961), for the ONP Wilderness Management Plan to actually enhance visitor exposure to wilderness areas on the North Olympic Peninsula, and in so doing, bring more of them to our area. Indeed, recreation is squarely within the authorized uses of wilderness areas, as 16 U.S.C. 1133(b) states:

"(b) Agency responsibility for preservation and administration to preserve wilderness character; public purposes of wilderness areas

"Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, each agency administering any area designated as wilderness shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes for which it may have been established as also to preserve its wilderness character. Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use." [emphasis added]

To that end, I ask that another alternative be created, since in my view, all of the alternatives created in the draft plan point to fewer visitors than at present. That being the case, I favor none of the currently drafted alternatives due to their obvious, adverse effect on Clallam County's economy.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments, and ask that you consider them favorably as you fashion ONP's Wilderness Management Plan.

Correspondence ID: 1037 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,14,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Ms. Creachbaum;

It is disappointing and disturbing to read the range of options in the Wilderness Stewardship Plan which are designed to limit access and use of Olympic National Park. The No Action Alternative is more of the same, inability to maintain infrastructure, such as, campgrounds, trails, roads and staffing. The ONP is an important tourist attraction for the Olympic Peninsula and your wilderness plan will continue to diminish those activities impacting the local economy.

As a youth growing up in Port Angeles, my family camped and hiked in the Park. I rode horses and camped in the backcountry for years, but as the Park reduced trail maintenance and increased restrictions on stock, it is now a

memory for me but others should have the same opportunities today. Backcountry restrictions, permits, fees, and regulations have made the backcountry less available to the casual camper, hiker, and equestrian.

Here are the answers to your 3 questions on page 10 of your newsletter:

1. NO. All of your alternatives are insufficient and should be thrown out!
2. There is nothing to like about your alternatives. The current No Action Alternative is more of the same excuses why the Park cannot maintain its' infrastructure. You don't have enough money so you will continue the same declining no action that you have done for the last 40 years. You need to change!
3. The backcountry trails and camp areas/shelters have not been properly maintained for decades. the wilderness is not overused or in danger, except from your lack of actions. Reallocate your budget to maintain trails and shelters in the backcountry (95% wilderness) and improve the infrastructure of the existing developed areas (5%) or visitor use. Fill campgrounds with visitors, have informative campfire programs, provide interpretive guided hikes, and build a core of volunteers to help out with the planning and implementation.

Nowhere in your WSP do you discuss how the ONP budget would be impacted by any of your alternatives. There is no financial data to inform the alternatives costs to implement or manage or what the economic impacts might be to the local economy. It would be fair to address these issues! How does one conclude the best alternative when there is not sufficient data to understand the costs of each alternative?

For example, under Alt. C you do not discuss the costs to complete the "restoration of a healthy ecosystem." Where will the money come from? Will you take funding from your budget reducing funding for existing programs?

Alt. B states that "quotas/use limits would be established for overnight use in the wilderness as well as for day use in the high use areas." Any policy to limit usage will negatively impact the economy and there is not public perception of ONP being over used.

Alt. D which is your preferred plan does little to assure the general public that ONP will be available for use. Past management has already reduced trail quality, stock usage, removed shelters, and destroyed historic structures. The Enchanted Valley Chalet is a perfect example of NO ACTION. The Park has done NOTHING to protect the Chalet for years! It appears that you have used the "minimum requirement analysis" for all of your alternatives!

Utah State University, Huntsman School of Business released a study titled the Economic Costs of Wilderness. Their findings concluded that "Wilderness designation is significantly associated with lower per capita income, lower total payroll, and lower total tax receipts in counties." "Wilderness is established for emotional, ecological, and cultural purposes. Our results show that those purposes are accomplished at a cost to local economies." The Olympic Peninsula is a text book case of negative impacts of the regulatory management policies of the Department of the Interior.

The Wilderness Stewardship Plan alternatives are too restrictive. Each alternative is designed to remove people or limit their ability to visit and enjoy Olympic National Park and that is unacceptable. The preferred alternative should encourage use of the 5% developed areas by improving campgrounds, interpretive programs and day hikes, some of which might be guided. The backcountry trails and shelters should be maintained and improved for the enjoyment of those who are more physically fit. Olympic National Park is not a treasure if we do not have access to and use of it!

Correspondence ID:	1038	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Polly Dyer Cascadia Broadband (local chapter of Great Old Broads for Wilderness)				
	Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	Member				
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Sara,				

We want applaud the staff at Olympic National Park (ONP) for developing such a wide range of preliminary

alternatives for the ONP Wilderness Stewardship plan. We also appreciate the Park's commitment to protecting and preserving the wilderness character of our magnificent Park.

We want to sign on to the Olympic Park Associates comment letter as it reflects our concerns and comments well. We support development of a Plan that combines elements of Alternatives B, C, and D. Although we support all of OPA's recommendations, we want to add emphasis to our support for retaining trail-less wilderness, managing visitor use, not considering historic structures as contributing to Wilderness character, and developing a plan for gray wolf recovery.

We look forward to participating in the next step of development for the Wilderness stewardship plan.

Correspondence ID:	1039	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	North Olympic Timber Action Committee Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms. Creachbaum;				

The North Olympic Timber Action Committee has been dealing with important economic issues that impact the economy of Olympic Peninsula communities since NOTAC was organized in 1989 when citizens became concerned about the economic impacts of the listing of the Northern Spotted Owl. Citizens understood then and today the important connection with the three vital economic sectors of the Olympic Peninsula economy. We could count on a robust logging industry, commercial and recreational fishing and a seasonal tourist industry with ONP as a world recognized attraction! the past 25 years have produced many negative changes in logging, fishing and tourism mostly due to Federal rules, laws and land management policies that have punished our economy. The four alternatives in the Wilderness Stewardship Plan are designed to reduce the numbers of visitors that will have access to ONP developed and wilderness areas. We reject the notion that visitation must be restricted by quotas when there is no perception that Olympic National Park is overused. It is difficult to properly address your alternatives because they lack supporting financial information to evaluate costs/benefits of preservation, restoration or the impacts to the local economy based on proposed restrictions/quotas! How will your actions impact your budget?

We do not believe that wilderness areas will be damaged by the modest numbers of backcountry hikers/campers. Most of the visitors to ONP frequent the attractions that are within the 5% developed areas. Misallocations of funding on restoration and wilderness protection has already curtailed use of many areas of ONP and under any of the proposed alternatives it appears that little will be done to reverse this trend and in fact your focus it to place more emphasis on restrictions and quotas. What are needed are budget priorities to address the backlog of maintenance on facilities, day use trails and roads so that the Park is fully functional for tourists.

We ask you to reject all your alternatives in the WSP and focus on increasing visitation to Olympic National Park with an emphasis on the 5% developed areas by improving campgrounds, host guided day hikes, campfire interpretive programs and allow small business to operate to add to the variety of activities without increasing the costs to ONP budget. In the wilderness areas, concentrate shelters, stock enclosures and backcountry amenities to help the visitors minimize impacts while still allowing access without quotas. The Olympic Peninsula economy should not be damaged by the poor management practices of the government that collects our taxes. We do not have to destroy the local economy to save Olympic National Park and the Park will not be destroyed by being a partner in a robust tourist industry!

Correspondence ID:	1040	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	I reviewed the Wilderness plan and then wrote the following questions about my concerns. I then attended the Seattle presentation on April 3, 2014 and discussed many of my questions with Ruth Scott. Some of my questions have been answered, but I thought it would be useful to pass along my concerns and questions.				

I have been hiking in the Olympics for 40 years. I took my son hiking up the Skok at 4 weeks and hope he will soon be joining me backpacking in the Olympics for another 40 or 50 years. I have spent some time in the Olympics every year since the early '70's. Some years it was only a couple of day hikes and some years it was backpacking for 10 to 12 weeks.

I value the beauty and solitude I find in the Olympics. I value the peace and quiet I find. I proposed to my wife on top of Kimta Peak. If I were to have to pick a church, these mountains would be it. Those alpine meadows are what I think of when I need calm.

I find myself very confused about the alternatives presented. Has the number of people visiting the backcountry increased dramatically? The 40,000 wilderness users figure does not appear to have changed in quite a long time. That's the number I heard in the late '80's or early '90's. And I'm not sure it's accurate. What is the purpose of the alternatives? What is the goal and how will it be measured? Is this a regularly scheduled review of the wilderness management plan or did something specific prompt it?

Alternative B emphasizes reduction of human imprint. Does this include not replacing bridges and footlogs? Does this include not replacing privies? Is one privy and one helicopter flight a year a greater human imprint than multitudes of catholes? Particularly if the catholes are not dug correctly? Will structures like the High Dose and High Hoh bridges not be replaced? If there are no helicopter flights, I suspect that these bridges will not be replaced. If not, their trails will become deadends and their use will be reduced. I suspect they will eventually be abandoned.

Alternative C would seek to remove non-native fish from wilderness rivers and lakes. How would this be done? I do NOT support the use of poisons no matter how benign. No limit fishing? OK. Electrocuting? Maybe. Under this alternative, cultural resources will be lost. Is this appropriate? Possibly. I'm more concerned about the Enchanted Valley Chalet than many of the backcountry shelters. But sooner or later, the Chalet will also disappear. Although I do not mind not repairing and not replacing backcountry shelters, I do not support the active removal of shelters as has happened in the past. Especially if it happens with little to no public comment.

I do not like bear cans. They're big, they're bulky, and they're heavy. I agree with their use in areas lacking suitable trees like the Skyline or Baileys. And I use them. Are the bear wires put in places with problem bears not working? Those bear wires are pretty self explanatory. If they are not working, why do you think bear cans will? Are bear cans any more foolproof (for the humans using them)? In places without bearwires, I seem to be able to find adequate trees. I don't disagree with bear can use or even necessity in places, but you still have the human factor and I'm not sure that the human factor with bear cans is better than the human factor with hanging food. I'm not sure that being "proactive" and requiring bear cans is better than being "proactive" and having good bear wires.

I understand that human waste is a major issue (the major issue?) for land managers. Human waste bags are only as good as they humans using them. I've heard reports that many people use the bags on Mt Whitney (as they are required to do) and then leave the full bags on the mountain. I think privies work better in general. Obviously though, in places like Mt Olympus and Mt Anderson, you need to use a bag. I am not in favor of my pack becoming a biohazard after a 5-day hike.

Alternative D emphasizes managing visitor use and providing greater range of wilderness experiences. Greater than what? Greater than the present time or Alternatives B and C? I am not clear on what a greater range of wilderness experiences would include.

If I need to get my permit in-person, will I need to drive 1 or 2 hours each way to Port Angeles to get my permit? How many times will I need to receive the educational component? Once or 3 or 4 times a year? Who will be teaching the educational component? Backcountry rangers or frontcountry rangers or VIPs? There is a huge difference in knowledge.

In Alternative D, why single out pack goats? Are pack goats in addition to horses and llamas or instead of horses and llamas? How much do backcountry horsemen help with trail maintenance in Olympic National Park?

From your maps provided, I can't come up with rhyme or reason for the changes or the trail zoning. In Alternatives B & D, Upper Lena appears to be a 2, but in Alternative C it appears to be a 4. In Alternative B, Six-Ridge appears

in the same zone as the Baileys. Regardless of the alternative if you decide to zone a trail, it would helpful if an explanation of the reasoning were available for the public.

What is the current management of the trails? How do the different alternatives compare with the current management level?

The number of rangers stationed in the backcountry has decreased a great deal in the last 25 years. Could this be the reason for problems? The wilderness does not need managing, people do.

You emphasize the three parks in one version in visitor presentations and your website, why do you think one alternative is appropriate for three parks in one? After an alternative is selected, how are current decisions passed on to future ONP leadership so we do not have mission creep. I would hate to pick Alternative B and then in 10 years have new ONP leadership decide that meant no more upkeep of backcountry bridges thereby cutting off trails. Or pick Alternative D and having hybrid trout planted to promote sport-fishing.

If I was forced to pick an alternative right now, I would probably go with C but I might go with A. In talking to Ruth Scott, I was reminded that there are smart, hard working people working on this project who are not likely to allow the problems and worst case scenarios with each alternative come true. It was very helpful to talk to her and hear some of the reasoning behind each issue. Whichever alternative is selected, it would be helpful to have the reasoning for the differences in trail maintenance in a document available to the public, perhaps on the ONP website.

Correspondence ID:	1041	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

I prefer Option A.

As a native of Port Angeles, I have always loved using our beautiful Olympic National Park and bringing guests from around the country as well as international visitors.

I have worked to promote O.N.P. through various local tourism group. I have also personally lobbied for our park in Washington, D.C.

Our town's local economy and schools benefit from our proximity to our beautiful national park. We welcome visitors and encourage use of our park. We promote this park, we use this park and we love this park.

Please keep it open for visitors to enjoy our beautiful Olympic National Park. Do not close off any more areas to the public. Option A is the best choice of all the alternatives offered.

We want to always feel welcome to our park. We love ONP!

Correspondence ID:	1042	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

I prefer Option A.

This park belongs to the people. We love our park and want to continue to use it and bring visitors.

Our community depends on the economic impact of welcoming visitors from around the state, around the nation and around the world to come to Port Angeles to visit our beautiful Olympic National Park. We promote the park, we

use the park and we love the park.

Please keep it open for visitors to enjoy our beautiful park. Do not close off any more areas to the public. We love our park! We always want to feel welcome to our park.

Correspondence ID:	1043	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,14,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

I prefer Option A.

The park is a great resource for our community as a visitor destination which enhances our entire community.

Please keep it open for visitors to enjoy our beautiful park. Do not close off any more areas to the public. We love our park!

Correspondence ID:	1044	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,15,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

I welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft Wilderness Stewardship Plan for Olympic National Park. Since arriving on the Olympic Peninsula in 2007 I have hiked and backpacked extensively in the Park and adjoining wilderness areas of the National Forest visiting every major watershed and all elevation zones both in the interior and along the coast. To enhance the wilderness experience, I purposely avoid visiting the park on weekends especially during the summer months, instead opting for weekdays and the shoulder seasons of late spring and early fall. In general, my experiences have been very positive, but occasionally they have been compromised by the sheer number of visitors in high-use areas such as Seven Lakes Basin, Royal Basin, Grand Valley and the Olympic coast. I was acutely aware of this at backcountry campsites, even in remote areas of the park.

With the extreme likelihood that park visitation will continue to increase, I think it imperative that a management strategy focus both on reducing human impacts (Alternative B) and protecting natural resources (Alternative C). The specific recommendations contained in both strategies are similar enough in scope to achieve essentially the same ends. On the other hand, I think Alternative D would adversely affect the qualities of wilderness and I urge you to reject this alternative.

My recommendations for specific strategies contained in "Preliminary Draft Alternative Management Strategies" are listed below in their order of appearance in the document.

Overarching Concept

The differences in emphasis between Alternatives B and C appear to be largely symbolic. The wilderness purist might argue that any evidence of human presence degrades wilderness quality. Therefore, any development including, but not limited to, structures, bridges, designated campsites, sanitation facilities, and maintained trails within the wilderness portion of the Park should be eliminated (more likely with Alternative B). But a wilderness area that receives multitudes of visitors a year is not a true wilderness, but a manged one. Management (i.e., human intervention) is necessary to enhance, protect and restore the physical aspects of wilderness (healthy ecosystems) when threatened by visitation, natural events (such as flood, slides, fire) and those caused by humans (such as the introduction of invasive species, climate change) (more likely with Alternative C).

Natural Resources

Introduction/General Description - I prefer Alternative C. I support management actions that emphasize protection of natural resources even if, in so doing, the human imprint were increased.

Wildlife Management: Fisheries - I prefer Alternative C.

Fire Management - I prefer either Alternative B or C.

Scientific Research - I prefer Alternative B.

Cultural Resources

Introduction/General Description - I prefer either Alternative B or C.

Archeological Resources - I prefer Alternative C.

Historic Structures - I prefer Alternative C.

Cultural Landscapes - I prefer either Alternative B or C.

Ethnographic Resources - I prefer Alternative C.

Visitor Use and Experience

Introduction/General Description - I prefer Alternative C.

Stock Use - I prefer Alternative C.

Campsites & Camping Area - I prefer Alternative C. Campsites at many backcountry campgrounds are spaced too closely and should be relocated to enhance the wilderness experience. Revegetation measures are needed in many.

Commercial Services - I prefer Alternative B.

Permits - I prefer either Alternative B or C. I am aware of three walk-in wilderness permit stations: Port Angeles, Staircase and Quinault. The Quilcene USFS ranger station could be an additional location for issuing permits for those visitors entering the northeast quadrant of the park.

Quotas & Use Limits - I prefer Alternative B.

Food Storage - Park personnel should explore methods of storage other than hard-sided canisters such as Kevlar sacks for efficacy.

Waste Management - I prefer Alternative B although high use areas at any elevation should have toilet facilities considering that a significant number of visitors will not adhere to the waste bag program. Any toilet facilities should be of a composting type or incorporate new technologies for waste decomposition.

Campfire Restrictions - I personally would like to see a total prohibition of campfires in the backcountry but prefer Alternative B among the choices offered.

Signs and Other Route Markings - I prefer Alternative B.

Hiking Trails/Access - I prefer Alternative B although reroutes should be considered where appropriate.

Stock Trails/Access - I prefer Alternative B.

Ranger-led Hikes/Programs - I prefer either Alternative B or C.

Park Operations

Introduction/General Description - I prefer Alternative B.

Wilderness Ranger Stations and Associated Structures - I prefer either Alternative B or C.

Facilities Maintenance: Trails - I prefer Alternative C.

Facilities Maintenance: Bridges/Water Crossings - I prefer Alternative C.

Waste Management - I prefer Alternative B.

Marine Debris - I prefer Alternative C. The continual accumulation of debris on inaccessible beaches is an especially difficult problem. Nothing detracts more from a wilderness experience along the Olympic coast than the sight of debris at a wrack line. Beaches close to trailheads receive some cleanup attention but those a day or more from trailheads or along difficult stretches of beach receive little or none. An annual cleanup even is insufficient. Perhaps, cleanup events could be scheduled more frequently relying heavily on volunteers. I also think it would be feasible to select sites at intervals along the beach where visitors could deposit trash that could be removed periodically by boat.

Aircraft Use - I prefer Alternative B.

I applaud the Park Service for its foresight in developing a new Stewardship Plan that should serve the Olympic National Park for decades to come.

Correspondence ID:	1045	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms, Creachbaum,				

I am writing to comment on the preliminary alternatives for the Olympic National Park's Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

I have enjoyed visiting the Olympic National Park since I was a young boy and feel it is critical to protect and preserve the natural resources and ecosystems in the park. I feel Alternative C is best overall to preserve the diversity and the natural environment. The zoning of trails and campsites seem to have been carefully thought out to allow for rewarding experiences to be realized by visitors in this great wilderness.

I do see much value in parts of Alternative B for protection that should be incorporated into the plan as well. The protection and restoration of natural resources with careful consideration as to the potential merits of protecting historic structures and cultural landscapes while minimizing the imprint of humans is important. The use of non-mechanized equipment and transport should also be included in the Stewardship Plan.

Maintaining as much of the park in an untrammelled state is very desirable, in my opinion. I am concerned that the control and management under Alternative D may be problematic, therefore the thought of providing visitors with a wider range of wilderness experiences could lead to undesired ecological and/or other consequences should proper control and management fail at any time.

Ranger-led interpretive hikes and education experiences would be a great asset and could greatly improve the visitor experience while offering valuable guidelines for park use and safety.

I would ask that a Wilderness District be created with a Wilderness District Ranger appointed to oversee all operations in the Olympic Wilderness to insure that all provisions of the final plan will be properly managed.

Thank you for your efforts in helping to create a plan for our Olympic Wilderness!

Correspondence ID: 1046 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

I have hiked, backpacked, camped and climbed in the Olympic National Park from the summit of Mount Olympus to the wild coast at Ozette for over thirty years. Protecting wilderness is very important to me. I am very pleased that the park staff is preparing a Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP). The park staff is to be commended for the very detail analysis and range of alternative presented.

The core guiding principle of the WSP must be the protection of Wilderness Unimpaired for future generations to enjoy as wilderness. While the national parks and wilderness areas have been set aside for the enjoyment of the citizens of the United States, the access for enjoyment must be tempered and balanced with the requirement to pass the parks and Wildernesses on the future generations unimpaired as wilderness.

I believe the recommendations contained in the common to all action alternatives (CTAA) are excellent and should be incorporated into the draft WSP. Without deviling into the multitudinous zones and trail designations, it is most important to me that access be as open and easy as possible within the constraints of protecting the wilderness resource from impairment. Therefore limits should only be placed to insure the continued integrity of the wilderness, i.e. there should be no limits to enforce subjective criteria of solitude.

Which brings me to the question of permits. Permits should be required of all backcountry travelers and overnight campers. This excludes day hikes, ranger talks and nature walks. Permits should be available on line, at trailhead ranger stations and at drop boxes at remote trailheads. Obtaining and displaying a permit gives a sense of responsibility and even those collected at remote drop boxes provide valuable usage data for planning and improvement of stewardship of the wilderness.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute these comments. I look forward to reviewing the draft WSP.

Correspondence ID: 1047 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,13,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:

If we want our citizens to appreciate and support our National Parks, then they must be given access to the Parks! This does not happen at Olympic National Park. 95% of the Park is effectively off-limits to all but those few who have the physical capability for rugged backpacking trips.

The options presented by the National Park Service in their WSP draft range from the presently inadequate public access to worse. The NPS should provide a new option that (1) moves away from the extreme mindset that wilderness and humans are incompatible, and (2) provides more access to the wilderness in the people's park.

Correspondence ID: 1048 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jun,26,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Park Service Authorities:

Since there are too many people in the world, it might be time to limit how many are in the backcountry.

Waste bags would be degrading and unenforceable and should not be required.

You shouldn't kill the fish in the lakes. It's getting so you can't fish anywhere any more, or else it's just catch and release. I want to eat what I catch.

Because I'm late in response I won't say anymore. Thank you for the mailing you sent me on the plan.

Correspondence ID:	1049	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,13,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Ms. Creachbaum,				

I am writing to comment on the preliminary alternatives for the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for Olympic National Park.

I believe alternative "C" would best preserve the natural environment and diversity in Olympic. The careful zoning of trails and campsites in alternative "C" make sense to me. I advocate to keep as much as possible primitive, while still allowing for a range of wilderness experiences. We must protect the natural resources and ecological processes of wilderness and some parts of alternative "B" are best at this, ie: quotas and use limits, management of historic structures and limits on administrative use of tools and aircraft.

Many of the action items in the draft zones are very good, and I would add that threatened, at risk, and endangered species should be recovered and restored, not just monitored. Wilderness education with all permits is fantastic!

Alternative "C" offers the best approach to mgmt. and research regarding native prairie/grasslands and I support the natural succession of native species in old homestead clearings.

Alternative "B" is best regarding management of fire. I oppose activities to reduce hazard fuel in regard to protecting non-essential buildings from fire.

I strongly urge you to create a Wilderness District for the Olympic Wilderness and appoint a District Ranger to oversee all operations within Wilderness.

Thank you for your hard work in planning for our precious Olympic Wilderness!

Correspondence ID:	1050	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Back Country Horsemen of America Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,18,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

Back Country Horsemen of America (BCHA) appreciates this opportunity to provide the following public comments on the preliminary draft alternatives developed for the parks Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP). We applaud the parks public outreach efforts to date and the ability of the public to shape the WSP alternatives at this early stage.

About Back Country Horsemen

BCHAs mission is to perpetuate the common sense use and enjoyment of horses in America's back country and wilderness and to ensure that public lands remain open to recreational stock use. A large part of our mission includes assisting the various government agencies and non-profit organizations in

the maintenance and management of public trails and horse camps, and to educate, encourage and solicit active participation in sustainable use of the back country resource by horsemen and women and the general public commensurate with our heritage.

BCHA works in cooperation with government agencies to help clear trails, maintain historic sites, assist ecological restoration activities, sponsor educational seminars and clinics, and assist with service projects as requested. In 2013 alone, BCHA volunteers documented in-kind contributions to the tune of approximately \$14 million for various projects throughout the nation. As you know, members of BCHAs Washington state affiliate have long been partners with the Olympic National Park in addressing backcountry maintenance needs and visitor education.

We greatly appreciate and value the recreational experience provided to horsemen and users of recreational pack and saddle stock in Olympic National Park. We take seriously our responsibility to demonstrate BCHAs ethic and commitment to preserving wilderness character. This includes BCHAs Leave No Trace Stock Users Education Program. BCHA has become the primary trainer of stock users in Leave No Trace principles and practices nationally through our Leave No Trace Masters Education Program. The program is a partnership between BCHA, state and affiliate members, the U.S. Forest Service the Leave No Trace™ Center for Outdoor Ethics.

Cultural Significance of Recreational Stock Use

The use of stock has played an important role in American culture. There is a long tradition of using pack and saddle stock not only in Olympic National Park but throughout the West. BCHA carries on this tradition in modern times, as does the robust and highly-respected pack stock program run by Olympic National Park that is used to support of park management and scientific investigation. Today's horsemen and women relish this cultural heritage and readily embrace the responsibility and obligation to care for our parks and public lands.

We recognize the conflicting policy directive which NPS has been given under the Wilderness Act and the demanding task the agency faces in simultaneously devoting much of the park to recreation while also protecting wilderness character. BCHA is committed to the long-term sustainable management of Wilderness in a way that ensures compatible recreational uses are allowed to occur for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

Our specific comments follow. They are limited primarily to the Visitor Use and Experience topic of the WSP preliminary draft alternatives.

Guiding Principle

In preparing the WSP one of the guiding principles should be that horseback riding, packing and hiking are primitive, non-mechanized modes of travel that are appropriate in Wilderness and consistent with the purposes and provisions of the Wilderness Act. These are historic and culturally significant uses that preceded congressional designation of current park Wilderness (1988), the establishment of Olympic National Park (1938) and its predecessor, Mount Olympus National Monument (designated by Presidential Proclamation in 1909). In other words, horseback riding, packing and hiking have occurred in harmony within current boundaries of park Wilderness for well over a century.

Within the parks enabling legislation was the expressed intent that National Park Service was to maintain the park for a principal use as a trail park. Clearly, backpacking as we know it today did not exist in 1938. The primary trail uses then were day hiking and overnight stock-assisted pack trips. It was not until the late 1960s/early 1970s that light-weight materials for backpacking were made available to mass markets and that backpacking became enjoyed by a broader public.

Purpose of the Plan

According to the parks March 2014 newsletter announcing the preliminary draft alternatives:

The purpose of the wilderness stewardship plan is to guide the preservation, management, and use of the parks wilderness area as defined by the Wilderness Act of 1964. The overarching goal of the plan is to restore, protect, and enhance overall wilderness character of the Olympic Wilderness.

It is our understanding that the baseline datum against which all wilderness management activities will be compared is the date when Public Law 100-668, the Washington Park Wilderness Act of 1988, was enacted by Congress. In other words, the goal of the WSP will be to restore, protect, and enhance overall wilderness character of the Olympic Wilderness using as a baseline those conditions that existed in 1988, when Congress deemed 876,669 acres within the park as suitable for designation as Wilderness. We would appreciate clarification in the Draft WSP Plan if we have assumed incorrectly.

Range of Alternatives

The preliminary draft alternatives, while noteworthy in many respects, do not appear to represent a reasonable range of alternatives given the stated purpose for the WSP. For example, Alternatives B and C appear inconsistent with several aspects of the parks 2008 General Management Plan (GMP) and NPS policy, while Alternative D fails in our view to meet the stated objective to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences. For example, the 2008 GMP includes several proposals to retain or improve trails in park Wilderness, including the retention of all existing wilderness trailheads, retention of cultural landscapes including historic road/trails/sites, and rehabilitation of the Boulder Creek Trail to provide access to hikers and horseback riders. The GMP includes caveats, understandably, that facilities and trails could be modified or relocated as a result of management decisions related to resource protection, restoration, visitor experience or increased visitation. But Alternatives B and C appear to cut against the grain of the GMPs intent to facilitate increased recreational use of the park and park Wilderness, presumably because recreational use levels have remained relatively low over the past decade.

Management direction-both stated and implied-in the 2008 GMP indicate there are few documented resource concerns or user conflicts associated with the existing park Wilderness trail system. Yet Alternatives B and C include significant reductions in the amount of trail miles available for recreational stock use. We are not clear on what basis the rationale for these reductions was formed.

Our understanding is that pack stock use by private parties has decreased substantially since park Wilderness was designated in 1988. It would follow that adverse or unacceptable impacts resulting from stock use on Wilderness trails would therefore be fewer at present than the WSP baseline datum of 1988. Further, we are not aware of Park Service documentation of unacceptable impacts-be it to water quality, cultural or natural resources-that can be attributed to use of horse and pack stock in park Wilderness. Thus, it appears to us that the proposed reduction in trail miles available to private stock users in WSP alternatives B and C are unwarranted and unjustifiable.

According to the parks detailed table of Preliminary Draft Alternative Management Strategies (March 2014), there are about 570 miles of maintained trails within park Wilderness, of which only 343 miles (or 60%) are currently available for stock use. Based on our calculations, miles of trail available for stock use under the preliminary draft WSP alternatives would total as follows:

- " Alternative A (No Action), with no change in current available trail miles;
- " Alternative B, 250 miles (or a reduction of 27% in currently available trail miles for stock users);
- " Alternative C, 185 miles (a 46% reduction in currently available trail miles for stock users); and
- " Alternative D, 340 miles (essentially reflects status quo, with some modifications based on resource issues).

We fail to understand why such drastic reductions are proposed in the absence of data to demonstrate that the park is experiencing overuse or unacceptable impacts as a result of horse and stock use. Need for Data on Recreational Use and Trends to Shape WSP Alternatives To better understand use trends and the context horse and stock use in park Wilderness, we recommend inclusion of a table in the draft WSP that outlines the following:

" Total trail miles available for hiking/backpacking and total trail miles available for private stock use in 1988 (or date closely matching Wilderness designation at Olympic National Park);
" Total trail miles currently available for hiking/backpacking and total trail miles available for private stock use;
" Total trail miles proposed to be available for hiking and total trail miles proposed to be available for private stock use for each WSP action alternative.

We respectfully request that the draft WSP also include a table depicting overall use levels (i.e., annual visitation), per trail user group, beginning the year park Wilderness was established to the present date. In other words, a table that depicts use levels by hikers, backpackers and recreational stock users from at least 1988 to present. The table will be useful to demonstrate trends and any notable changes in trail-related recreational activities within the past quarter-century.

It is our understanding that current visitation by private stock users is substantially less today than it was in the 1980s. We would appreciate confirmation of that assumption with data presented in the draft WSP. Moreover, we encourage park personnel to consider options to mitigating any real or perceived conflicts associated with recreational stock use in Wilderness prior to including alternatives in the draft WSP oriented toward outright trail closure. Doing so would appear consistent with NPS policy, as described below.

Alternatives B and C Appear to Violate NPS Policy as They Represent De Facto Closures to Stock Use

As described previously, there appears to be no reasonable basis to support the restrictions proposed in Alternatives B and C relative to which trails remain available for recreational stock use. To structure WSP alternatives that include reductions/restrictions to hiking or stock use appears to us to represent a de facto closure that is neither warranted nor supportable.

Current NPS Management Policies describe a series of steps to be taken by park superintendents in order to determine visitor carrying capacity (Section 8.2.1). Only after that process has completed its course, such as through the current WSP, should decisions to restrict an otherwise appropriate visitor use be considered. NPS policy regarding visitor carrying capacity can be summarized as follows:

1. Superintendents will identify ways to monitor for and address unacceptable impacts on park resources and visitor experiences.
2. The level of analysis necessary to make decisions about carrying capacities is commensurate with the potential impacts or consequences of the decisions. The greater the potential for significant impacts or consequences on park resources and values or the opportunities to enjoy them, the greater the level of study and analysis and civic engagement needed to support the decisions.
3. If and when park uses reach a level at which they must be limited or curtailed, the preferred choice will be to continue uses that are encouraged under the criteria listed in section 8.2, and to limit or curtail those that least meet those criteria.

NPS Management Policies, Section 8.2.1, emphasis added.

Section 8.2, Visitor Use, of the NPS Management Policies defines unacceptable impacts on park resources and visitor experiences as impacts that, individually or cumulatively, would:

- " be inconsistent with a parks purposes or values, or
- " impede the attainment of a parks desired conditions for natural and cultural resources as identified through the parks planning process, or
- " create an unsafe or unhealthy environment for visitors or employees, or
- " diminish opportunities for current or future generations to enjoy, learn about, or be inspired by park resources or values, or
- " unreasonably interfere with park programs or activities, or an appropriate use, or the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or the natural soundscape maintained in wilderness and natural, historic, or commemorative locations within the park, or NPS concessioner or contractor operations or services.

Emphasis added. The policies go on to state the following:

If and when a superintendent has a reasonable basis for believing that an ongoing or proposed public use would cause unacceptable impacts to park resources or values, the superintendent must make adjustments to the way the activity is conducted to eliminate the unacceptable impacts. If the adjustments do not succeed in eliminating the unacceptable impacts, the superintendent may (1) temporarily or permanently close a specific area, or (2) place limitations on the use, or (3) prohibit the use (Section 8.2, emphasis added).

Clearly the WSP has yet to follow the course recommended by NPS policies and, at present, there is no reasonable basis for placing limitations on recreational stock use in park Wilderness in the absence of compelling data on unacceptable impacts on park resources and visitor experiences resulting from such use. We recommend that action alternatives in the WSP that restrict hiking and stock use be amended to eliminate the de facto closures currently included in Alternatives B and C.

Use of Adaptive Management in Lieu of WSP Alternative-based Restrictions

For those WSP alternatives that restrict either hiking/backpacking or recreational stock use, we encourage the Park Service to disclose the body of science being relied upon to form the basis of the proposed restrictions. As an alternative to be included in the WSP, we propose the application of adaptive management techniques like visitor education and interpretive opportunities, the rerouting of segments of trail where conflicts are known to occur or other less onerous restrictions including quotas regarding either the number of parties or temporal zoning in lieu of WSP alternatives that begin with the assumption that stock use must be limited. Certainly, existing adaptive management frameworks like Limits of Acceptable Change (and the NPS version, Visitor Experience and Resource Protection) could be employed in the Olympic National Park WSP in order to lay a foundation for the collection of visitor data on potential user conflicts and management options to minimize or avoid it.

If social science literature is to be used to determine social carrying capacity, we would ask that the science is even-handed with respect to whose perceptions are being taken into account in making management decisions (i.e., hikers, horsemen or both). Recently, we have seen closures proposed for stock use in another national park based on a narrowly-applied study from which the social preferences of backpackers and hikers was extrapolated. Rarely do we see social science that takes into account also the views and desired experience of traditional horsemen and stock users. We hope and expect that any application of social carrying capacity in the WSP will be balanced in this regard.

We remain optimistic that most types of visitor conflict can be resolved through education and broader awareness of the history and role of horse and stock use in the park. Consequently, BCHA supports the development of additional alternative(s) that better meet the objective to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences within the confines of the Wilderness Act and NPS policy.

Proposal to Limit Stock Use to Designated Trails Must be Supported by Science

We question the concept of limiting stock use to only designated trails below elevations of 3,500 feet. Horsemen largely understand the need for the current prohibition on off-trail travel above 3,500 feet in the park, as many of the subalpine and alpine environments enjoy short growing seasons and vegetation and soils are relatively sparse and fragile. However, current alternatives that would limit stock use only to designated trails appear both unwarranted and impractical. We are unaware of a science-based rationale that would support the restriction, which at present is common to all action alternatives. We offer the following example of its perceived practicality.

A horse rider would be in violation of park rules for leaving the trail tread in order to water their horse in an adjacent creek. In addition, individuals or horse parties, which already are required to be small in size in park Wilderness (no more than 12 people and 8 head of stock), would not be allowed to step off the trail tread to enjoy a picnic lunch in the shade of an adjacent stand of trees. Any time a riding individual or party stopped for a break, it would be forced to remain occupying the trail and blocking it from other

travelers (with the exception of designated campsites). A resting party would force other parties, be they on foot or on horseback, to venture off-trail in order to circumvent the resting party. This could result in some visitors feeling increasingly crowded in park Wilderness, particularly if they had to circumvent multiple resting stock parties on a given day. Perceptions of crowded conditions often result in greater negative impacts. Those negative impacts could then be cited to by anti-stock individuals or organizations as justification for further restricting stock use in the park.

Proposed Remedy: In non-camping situations, if stock users traveling below 3,500 feet elevation were allowed to temporarily move off the trail tread, say no more than 100 yards laterally, the potential for conflict and feelings of being crowded would largely be alleviated. In reality, it appears that off-trail activity is very limited and may bring, as described above, the added appearance of dispersing use—particularly in crowded trail corridors. We recommend the WSP alternatives include some iteration of this proposed remedy and that NPS horse and pack stock users be consulted as to its practicality in preserving wilderness character.

Definition of Self-Reliant Travel and Camping used in Alternative B

We would appreciate a statement in the draft WSP regarding what is intended by the term in Alternative B regarding self-reliant travel and camping. We assume this has to do primarily with self-registration for entering the Wilderness and is not intended to imply a preference by the NPS for parties traveling on foot versus either on horseback or parties accompanied by commercial outfitters. Our understanding of the current Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character (Landres, et al, 2008, Keeping It Wild) and its use of the term self-reliance pertains to facilities and management restrictions on visitor behavior that decrease self-reliant recreation and, in turn, could detract from visitors realization of outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. Please confirm our interpretation.

A Policy of No New Trails is Neither Warranted or Justified at this Time

At present, all WSP action alternatives include a recommended policy of no new trail construction in park Wilderness. The table of Preliminary Draft Alternative Management Strategies (March 2014) states for Alternatives B, C and D: There would not be an increase in the overall trail mileage maintained for hikers or stock users. At a minimum, the proposal could be interpreted to contradict the stated intention of Alternative D that emphasizes managing visitor use and recreation to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences. At least any opportunities to consider new trail construction would be foreclosed.

A policy of no new trails unduly limits the ability of the Park Service to accommodate public demand for future trails even in those cases where new trail construction might preserve or enhance wilderness character. The ability of the public and future generations to access and enjoy Wilderness was a central tenant of the Wilderness Act. At Olympic National Park, trails serve as the arteries by which most people experience park Wilderness. We recognize that some trails may need to be relocated due to resource or wildlife habitat considerations, but the lack of currently available maintenance funding alone is not sufficient reason to permanently close a trail or trail system.

We request an alternative be included in the WSP that maintains the current trail system largely intact, allows for continued maintenance of bridges where it serves to promote visitor safety and protect resources, and which also allows consideration of new trails where warranted. This alternative should also include the option of bringing abandoned trails into the maintained trail system if and when resources become available to do so.

It is our understanding that the park superintendent always retains discretion whether or not to construct new trails on a case-by-case basis, irrespective of a blanket policy whether or not to allow new trail construction. To institute a blanket policy of this type, as currently proposed for all WSP action alternatives, would preclude any option for new trail construction throughout the life of the plan—which if the relevance and applicability of the park's 1982 Backcountry Management Plan is any indication, could mean a 30-year waiting period before the concept of new trail construction is revisited.

If indeed the intent of Alternative D is to managing visitor use and recreation to provide visitors with a greater range of wilderness experiences, a more reasonable approach in our view would be to include in the WSP an alternative regarding trails available for hiking and stock use that reflects the extent to which current trails were available for use at the time of wilderness designation (i.e., 1988).

In addition, its long been lamented among the equine community that park Wilderness beaches are not open for horseback riding. We understand there are existing limitations to providing for horse access to park beach areas, in terms of ready access to trailheads and trailhead facilities. But we respectfully request that a WSP alternative include the option of one or more such beach access opportunities if it might be accomplished in a way that preserves wilderness character. In our view, it would be wholly consistent with Alternative D and providing a greater range of wilderness experiences if the WSP were to explore the potential for such beach horse-riding opportunities.

Conclusion

Thank you for this opportunity to submit public comments on WSP. We appreciate the efforts of park personnel to seek every opportunity to include the pack and saddle stock community in this and similar planning efforts. It is our belief that only through strong partnerships and effective collaboration can our mutual goals of preserving Wilderness character and maintaining publicly-supported trail systems be achieved.

Correspondence ID:	1051	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,17,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	E-mail				
Correspondence:	re: Wilderness Stewardship Plan				

I received hard copies of the documents and maps for the Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP), and attended the public meeting in Seattle on April 3, at which I had conversations with Park staff and other interested citizens. I spent a good deal of time going over the documents and maps, and spent several hours on the phone talking with several other individuals about the proposals outlined in the WSP, as well as communicating with several others online.

At first I was quite confused by the information included in the documents and maps, and wondered if perhaps if it was my own inability to make sense of all of it. However, after the aforementioned communications with others, I had to conclude that it was no fault of my own that I was unable to understand clearly exactly what the proposals meant. To a man, all agreed that the proposals outlined in the documents, as well as the maps, were confusing at best.

The maps contain errors, omissions, and contradictions which make absolutely no sense. There are some trails on the "Current Trail Classes" map which no longer exist, yet they are shown as being part of the current trail mile inventory. Other trails which are viable routes are not shown at all. The "zone" assignments are not clear. When I inquired about those trails shown on the "Current Trail Classes" map which are no longer viable routes (having been abandoned for decades) I was told that those trails were included in the current trail inventory. When I inquired about trails which do not appear on the map, I was told that those are "user maintained" trails: the rationale being that since hikers use them, they are "user maintained".

The documents, charts, graphs, and "zone" proposals simply do not make sense. A bar graph clearly shows that trail miles for each alternative vary (in one case substantially), but when an inquiry was made regarding those the response was that trail miles would be essentially the same under each alternative.

While the outlined proposals use eloquent language and espouse lofty and noble goals, they do not clearly indicate exactly what sort of action is being proposed for each individual trail within the Park.

What is needed is a clear and accurate listing of all trails being affected, and exactly what sort of action is being proposed for each of those trails. Lacking that, no informed opinion can be made of any of the proposed alternatives.

Therefore, I reject all the outlined proposals (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and suggest that a more comprehensive and more easily understood proposal be offered for public consideration.

re: "Four Qualities of Wilderness"

When I inquired as to how the "Four Qualities of Wilderness" were formulated, I was told that they were written by an interagency group.

Each of them mentions the word "modern".

When I inquired as to the definition of "modern" (as used in the WSP "Four Qualities") I was told "anything other than Native American."

When I asked specifically (by name) if Grant Humes, Lars Ahlstrom, Peter Roose, and George Shaube (early Olympic Peninsula homesteaders) would be considered "modern" I was told that yes, by that definition, they would be.

It is inexplicable that homestead cabins which have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places can by some stretch of the imagination have been built by men who would be considered "modern".

Therefore, the "Four Qualities of Wilderness" are based on a false presumption: that "wilderness" can only be those places where man's imprint has not been left on the land.

Moreover, a point raised previously by a woman with a PhD who currently is employed in the capacity of a State historian is that this completely ignores the fact that men have been on the Olympic Peninsula for at least 12000 years, and lived on, managed, and considerably altered the landscape over millenia.

While the Wilderness Act of 1964 is clearly a great piece of legislation, it does not recognize the fact that this continent was peopled for thousands of years and carried a considerable population of people who significantly altered the landscape; clearly evidenced from archaeological records and oral histories.

Aboriginal tribesmen and European settlers and explorers were on the Olympic Peninsula long prior to the formation of Olympic National Park, and they left a permanent imprint on the landscape.

To try to erase their effects using the Wilderness Act of 1964 is historic revisionism at its worst.

Moreover, the approach being used ignores the fact that the Wilderness Act of 1964 does not trump, supersede, or override other federal statutes with which Olympic National Park must comply: The Organic Act of 1916, the Historic Sites act of 1935, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as well as the enabling legislation which created Olympic National Park in 1938. The Wilderness Act of 1964 contains very clear language regarding the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which requires the Director of the Department of the Interior to be the steward of those historic features within National Parks and other federal facilities.

To comply with all applicable federal statutes, a completely different approach needs to be taken in formulating a Wilderness Stewardship Plan: one which takes into consideration all historic features, not those arbitrarily chosen by a select few.

The Park has a long history of disregarding their responsibility regarding the historic features within the Park, from the orgiastic practice of the destruction of the majority of the trail shelters in the 1970s to the current debacle with the Enchanted Valley Chalet.

This must stop. The laws are very clear regarding historic features, particularly those which have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Any Wilderness Stewardship Plan the Park formulates must comply with all federal statutes, not just those arbitrarily and capriciously chosen by those presently in positions of authority.

re: Wilderness Permits

The proposals outlined in the WSP documents seem to suggest that all Wilderness Permits will be issued only through the Wilderness Information Center in Port Angeles, or satellite Ranger Stations around the Park, and that no longer will users be able to self-register at trailheads.

This is an absolutely unacceptable proposal.

I have been a visitor and hiker at ONP for 56 years, and have always filled out permits at the trailhead without any problems (except in those cases where no permits were in the trailhead registration kiosk.)

To require me (or any other visitor) to travel far out of their way to procure a permit places an undue burden on the user.

In my own particular case, I need to be at the trailhead at the crack of dawn, to take advantage of the low water of the early morning.

Fording the Queets with a fully-laden pack is challenge enough at that hour. Later in the day it may pose a hazard. Requiring me to stop at North Fork Quinault Ranger Station or Kalaloch (or anywhere else) for a permit delays my arrival at the trailhead by at least an hour to an hour and a half, by which time the water may have risen considerably.

I have read many online trip reports that noted the required stop for a permit in Port Angeles delayed arrival to the trailhead by several hours, in some cases putting hikers at the trailhead at dusk.

Wilderness Permits should be easily available to the public at all trailheads, as well as online. The entire world does not work on a "nine-to-five" schedule, nor does it "plan ahead": for the last 26 years, virtually all of my visits to the Queets have been a last-minute-fly-by-the-seat-of-my-pants-depending-on-the-weather-and-low-water affair. That is my reality. What does the Park propose to do to accommodate my needs?

re: Bear Canisters

I made at least two or three (possibly four) inquiries asking for information regarding incidents that may have occurred within ONP involving bears. Unfortunately I received no responses from the Park.

Lacking any clear evidence which indicates that bear canisters are an item which should be required in all areas of the Park, I must reject any such proposal. Should the Park be willing and able to offer forth evidence which proves that bear canisters should be required, I would be willing to reconsider my position.

Understandably, there may be some areas where bear canisters are clearly necessary. Ozette and the Olympic Coast are plagued by pesky raccoons. But to institute a requirement for bear canisters in all areas of the Park without first reviewing each area on a case by case basis is regulatory overkill.

re: Manure Catchers for Pack Stock

I made an inquiry (to ONP's fisheries biologist) asking if there was any definitive information regarding water quality issues on streams and lakes within ONP: specifically if there was any information regarding fecal coliform levels.

Unfortunately I received no response to my inquiry.

Lacking any evidence indicating that there exist any water quality issues directly caused by pack stock, a regulation requiring "manure catchers" on pack stock is unacceptable, and regulatory overkill.

Should the Park be willing or able to provide information which indicates a need for such a regulation, I would be willing to reconsider.

However, at the present time, considering the abundance of elk droppings one can find on any gravel bar or along any trail, such a proposal must be rejected.

re: "Blue Bags"

While it may well be necessary and appropriate to require the use of "Blue Bags" in some sensitive areas, it is clearly regulatory overkill to require them in all areas of the Park.

When I made an inquiry as to why such a proposal was included in the WSP documents, I was told an anecdotal

story about "toilet paper blossoms" surrounding a privy.

As with the "manure catchers", no evidence has been provided by the Park that indicates there are any water quality issues as a result of the disposal of human waste within the Park. Rather, what I was told was that it was more a visual issue.

I had a conversation with an aide to Senator Slade Gorton some years back regarding this issue along Skate Creek Road just south of Mount Rainier. What it came down to was that the problem is one of education.

It is an education problem. If you make it an enforcement problem, you will garner only non-compliance and add to the work load of your already overloaded law enforcement.

I suggest a more intelligent approach be used regarding this matter.

re: Reduction of trail miles and/or reduced maintenance of existing trails

Trail miles have been reduced over 41% since 1935. Any further reduction in net trail miles, or any action which lowers the maintenance standards of any existing trails is simply not acceptable.

re: The Big Picture

In the Park's formulation of the proposals for the WSP, it appears they forgot about their primary mission. I would suggest Park planners go back and re-read the Organic Act of 1916, as well as the founding legislation which created Olympic National Park in 1938.

Federal legislation is generally very carefully written, using a very careful and deliberate choice of words, language, and sentence structure.

While both the aforementioned statutes charge the Park with preserving the natural landscape and native flora and fauna, they both make greater emphasis on "the people".

Go ahead- go back and read them again: you'll find "people" mentioned repeatedly.

Is it a Wilderness? Or is it a Park?

Answer: it is a PARK, for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the people.

Those who want "wilderness" have several options surrounding ONP: Brothers Wilderness, Wonder Mountain Wilderness, Buckhorn Wilderness, etc.

Certainly we have "wilderness" within the Park, and certainly it has been mandated by the Washington State wilderness Act of 1984, but by no stretch of the imagination is it now, nor should it ever be "wilderness" without people, without facilities, or without historic features created by those other than Native Americans.

Bottom line: Park planners need to go back to the drawing board and approach the formulation of a Wilderness Stewardship Plan which takes into consideration all applicable federal statutes; offers clear, concise, readily understood proposals on a trail-by-trail basis; and puts at the forefront its primary mission: the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the people.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Correspondence ID:	1052	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Washington State Dept. of Archaeology & Historic Preservation State Government				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,19,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) has taken the opportunity to review Olympic National Park (ONP) Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) Preliminary Draft Alternatives. The following comments and recommendations are based on our review of the draft WSP and are made on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36CFR800.

1. In general, we appreciate ONP undertaking this planning effort and incorporating in the four alternatives management strategies for the park's cultural and historic properties (structures, sites, buildings, districts, objects, and landscapes), that are listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places.

2. Another general comment and recommendation is made to make sure that the final adopted WSP is consistent and true to its purpose in appropriately managing the wide range of resources that fall within wilderness areas. To this end, we recommend that existing resources (such as historic trail shelter, lookouts, etc.) receive priority consideration for maintenance, protection, and re-use before the introduction of new facilities or infrastructure.

3. We recommend that language on pages 6-8 in the draft alternative matrices be clarified or more clearly defined in terms of how cultural resources would be managed under the alternatives. Some of the phrases and terminology appears to be confusing and/or subject to a range of different (and potentially conflicting) interpretations. For example, the phrase "protected [or maintained] to the extent practicable." Another example are phrases that state resources will be protected according to "pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values." Given varying interpretations of legislation regarding wilderness areas and cultural resource protection, we recommend language that is more specific in terms of how these resources will be treated under each alternative.

4. To expand upon comments in #3, we also recommend language that clarifies the distinction between the alternatives in terms of how cultural resources would be treated. This is particularly true of alternatives B and C. For example, under B for cultural landscapes, the plan states that they would be "protected and maintained according to pertinent laws and policies..." Under C, the text reads that landscapes would be "maintained to the extent practicable according to pertinent laws and policies..." Again, it would be helpful to understand the distinctions here and how that translates into a specific course of action for managing all the cultural resources.

5. The poster item "Other Features of Value Quality of Wilderness Character" states that "It has been determined that the only features within the Olympic Wilderness that will be addressed are Native American resources (i.e. archaeological resources, traditional cultural properties, and ethnographic resources.) While inclusion of Native American resources is important and strongly supported, we do not see a stated rationale for excluding resources with other "historical" value. We recommend that the "Other Features of Value" include the full range of National Register eligible or listed properties.

6. In regard to the three "action" alternatives, we are concerned about language in alternatives B and C that indicates that "natural processes would prevail" without intervention by ONP when significant cultural resources are threatened. This strategy is also mentioned in regard to fire management on page 5. Therefore, DAHP does not recommend selection of these alternatives.

7. Text describing alternative D appears to be more proscriptive and pro-active in terms of managing the range of cultural resource property types in wilderness areas. Therefore, we recommend blending management strategies in alternative D with ONP's previous

cultural resource planning and management efforts (proactive inventory, evaluation, and preservation) in the General Management Plan and referenced in alternative A. This would appear to bring a higher level of certainty about the future of these resources by arriving at long and short-term management plans tailored to the circumstances of each resource and vetted by all interested and affected parties.

8. While the draft WSP describes the 6 Wilderness Zones, it is not clear how the zoning categories affect the outcomes described in the alternatives. Therefore, we recommend that the zoning categories be appropriately applied to the resources and property types and integrated into the adopted WSP.

9. In regard to scientific research on page 6, language under the CTAA leaves the impression that scientific research about cultural and historic resources or past uses and practices would be excluded or receive lower priority. It is recommended that the intent here be clarified in regard to research that focuses on cultural and historic resources. It should also be clarified that data recovery being conducted to satisfy mitigation requirements would be considered as scientific research and/or authorized in compliance with Section 106 consultations.

10. It is recommended that use of motorized transportation and mechanical equipment be allowable in the WSP when found appropriate toward the management and protection of cultural and historic resources.

11. We recommend inclusion of language in the WSP that encompasses regional history and the cultural environment in regard to interpretation, signage, partnerships, volunteers, and other appropriate aspects of managing the wilderness area.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment and the draft WSP alternatives.

Correspondence ID:	1053	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	The Wilderness Society Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preliminary draft alternatives for the Olympic National Park (ONP) Wilderness Stewardship Plan. We appreciate the considerable effort that the Park has done in engaging the public early on in this important planning process. We recognize that the preliminary draft alternatives are an additional step, not required by the National Environmental Policy Act. We have found it to be an extremely useful and well received opportunity to gain a better understanding of the direction of the plan and to provide our feedback at this stage in the process.

Washington Wild is a statewide 501(c) nonprofit organization working to protect wild lands and waters in Washington State since 1979. Many of our members and supporters hike, hunt, fish, camp, climb, horseback ride and paddle in Olympic National Park and the Olympic Wilderness. In the late 1980s we helped support the Washington Parks Wilderness Act which became law in 1988 and designated the Olympic Wilderness.

The Wilderness Society was formed in 1935 to protect wilderness and inspire Americans to care for our wild places. Since our inception, we have led the effort to permanently protect nearly 110 million acres of wilderness in 44 states, including Washington. We strive to complete a system of public wildlands that preserve the unique natural heritage of all Americans. The creation of the Olympic Wilderness in 1988 was a step toward this vision. We look forward to working with Olympic National Park to preserve the unique wilderness character of the area and ensure current and future generations can discover and enjoy the Olympic wilderness.

Wilderness is the strongest and most lasting protection for our public lands. In Washington State our thirty-two Wilderness areas, totaling more than 4 million acres, are a key contributor to the high quality of life we all enjoy. In fact, access to places like the back-country of Olympic National Park is a major reason why many of us choose to live, work and play here in Washington State. The Olympic Wilderness provides many benefits, including important wildlife habitat for a number species such as salmon, steelhead and Roosevelt Elk; the promise of solitude and renewal for a growing population; and diverse, world-class recreational opportunities.

Washington Wild and The Wilderness Society not only designate additional Wilderness in Washington State, our organizations are also committed to the management of statutorily designated Wilderness areas across the state. As demand for outdoor recreation opportunities continues to grow, there is a need to enhance and protect appropriate recreational access from the front country to the Wilderness. This is a major focal point as we work with a broad and diverse array of stakeholders to develop new Wilderness proposals as well as support prudent management of our existing wilderness areas. In the end, our organizations spend years (sometimes decades) advocating for Wilderness designations is so that people, especially future generations, can experience these incredible areas. We believe that the human experience was central to the original vision of the authors of the Wilderness Act. Now more than ever, with rising obesity, increasing pressures on our natural world and a near epidemic disconnection between youth and wild places, we need Wilderness in the mosaic of lands that compose our great outdoors.

After reviewing the draft preliminary alternatives and discussing components with ONP planning staff, we appreciate the opportunity to offer the following comments:

I. Need for a Wilderness Management Plan

We appreciate the time and resources it takes to develop a Wilderness Stewardship Plan and support the effort by the agency to complete this requirement. Individual Wilderness plans are required because different Wilderness units can vary significantly in size, attributes, congressional direction use patterns and opportunities.

Because the Olympic Wilderness includes more than 95% of Olympic National Park and protects a diversity of elevations, managing this Wilderness presents some special challenges. Unlike the considerable amount of Forest Service designated Wilderness in Washington State (which is more than 90% higher elevation areas above 3,000 feet) the Parks expansive Wilderness includes much of the lower-elevation areas that are so important for wildlife habitat, old growth and mature forests, and multi-season accessible recreational opportunities.

From a management perspective, this requires a careful balance. For example, the plan must provide the increasingly rare opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation while also protecting the natural qualities of the resource. From our perspective, the Wilderness Stewardship Plan is an opportunity to demonstrate that a Wilderness designation can provide the strong and lasting protections for the wild places that make the Olympics globally recognized while also allowing current and future generations the ability to enjoy and experience these incredible places.

II. Embracing Wilderness Monitoring and Adaptive Management

The interagency technical report, *Keeping it Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character* across the National Wilderness Preservation System, is a useful resource and we are comforted to see that park planning staff have made use of it.

Developed in 2008, the technical report is a useful monitoring strategy that can inform policy decisions to preserve wilderness character as required by the 1964 Wilderness Act. The focus of the document is described in its Purpose and Scope section (Pg2):

The purpose of this monitoring strategy is to improve wilderness stewardship by providing managers (from field office to Washington Office) in the four wilderness management agencies with a tool to assess how wilderness character is changing over time. Information from this monitoring is needed by on-the-ground managers and decision-makers to assess whether stewardship actions for an individual wilderness are fulfilling the mandate to preserve wilderness character. Information from this monitoring is also needed to inform program managers and decision makers about the effectiveness of agency policies to preserve wilderness character.

As a monitoring strategy, it is useful to identify if wilderness characteristics in a given unit are declining, improving or staying the same relative to a baseline. However, it does not provide one-size-fits-all policy prescriptions for managing wilderness.

Given that this is the first Wilderness Stewardship Plan developed by the Park for the Olympic Wilderness since its designation in 1988, we are not aware, and do not expect, that the monitoring strategies in this document have been formally administered. As a result, the monitoring protocol should yield valuable information that can inform wilderness management in the years to come - even during the next plan cycle.

It will be important to embrace an adaptive management approach within the Wilderness Stewardship Plan that both allows these monitoring protocols to take place and inform and justify potential policy changes in the future. There are a number of areas where this type of adaptive management can lead to policy changes within the plan cycle. For example, permit protocols and site-specific use quotas can be adjusted based on these monitoring cycles within the plan cycle.

We are concerned that some of the alternatives make assumptions that policy changes are necessary to preserve elements of wilderness character without the benefit of monitoring data. Especially in cases where interim decisions can be implemented during the plan cycle, this seems unwarranted. For example, Alternatives B & C propose implementing an in-person (or through phone) permitting process which will likely require considerably more resources to administer and potentially result in greater difficulty to Park users and subsequent decrease in visitation. It may be prudent to proceed with an online permitting option as described in Alternative D and adaptively manage any changes in permit policy justified by monitoring data within the plan cycle.

Camping areas, commercial services, quotas and use limits are other areas addressed in the plan that would benefit from this adaptive management approach if they are deemed to be necessary.

III. Embracing Recreation as Part of Wilderness Management

Outstanding and quality recreational opportunities are one of the key benefits of a Wilderness designation to the American people. The draft alternative document rightfully recognizes that (as does the Keeping it Wild monitoring strategy) by highlighting unconfined and primitive recreation as one of the four distinct and necessary qualities of wilderness character.

The Olympic Wilderness is no different. No matter what the season, there are a myriad of opportunities to explore Olympic National Park such as, backpacking for miles through the high-country, testing your whitewater skills on a free-flowing river, summiting a snow-capped peak, cross-country skiing or snowshoeing through a quiet forest, hiking the rugged Washington coastline, discovering plants and animals on a nature trail, riding horseback through the Wilderness or fishing a secluded alpine lake.

Too often, Wilderness is viewed through a misanthropic lens that discounts a key reason why the conservation community advocates for, and ultimately Congress designates, these special areas. We encourage the Park to adopt alternatives that embraces recreational opportunities. In specific areas, different types of recreation may be deemed in conflict with other Wilderness characteristics and may merit restrictions or additional management attention. In other areas, specific recreational opportunities may be found consistent and encouraged.

IV. Additional or Revised Alternatives Are Warranted

We would like to express our appreciation for the agency's extra effort to provide an opportunity for the public to give input post-scoping and prior to the development of the alternatives that will appear in the draft plan next year. We understand that this is a step that goes above and beyond the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. In conversation with park planning staff, the opportunity to make meaningful recommendations to the draft alternatives were repeatedly emphasized.

Of the nearly 50 management issues highlighted in Preliminary Draft Alternative Management Strategies matrix, the majority of the range of management suggestions relating to Cultural Resources, Natural Resources, Park operations and Partnerships and Outreach seemed reasonable.

However, in the Visitor Use and Experience Section we provide a number of suggestions to better balance opportunities for confined and primitive recreation while also managing for the other key qualities of wilderness.

A. Stock use:

Equestrians are a historic user group in Wilderness areas that also provide a significant amount of volunteer trail work which is an important asset during these difficult budget times. The provisions common to all alternatives (CTA and CTAA) relating to designated trail use and off trail prohibition above 3,000 feet seem reasonable. We anticipate that there would need to be some stock trail access above 3,000 ft. to access passes and connect stock trail systems. We would like to see the management guidance in the Stewardship plan not presume that there would need to be a reduction in stock trails as in Alternative C. To the extent that the monitoring data being set forward in this plan argues for a reduction of a specific trail or if a budget decision is merited, the agency should be able to take that action during the planning cycle. Budgets will change over the years and it may be that decision will need to be made based on future funding for trail maintenance or staffing but the 10-15 year Wilderness management plan is not the place to make those decisions. Washington Wild, The Wilderness Society and user groups like the Backcountry Horsemen of Washington would like to explore the opportunity over the next several years to help increase funding for trail maintenance for the Park. Indicating that regardless of budget trends certain trails will need to be reduced is not necessary and could be a disincentive for that type of collaboration. With respect to extending stock use to pack goats (in Alternative D) we see no reason why that should be an issue and support that provision.

B. Campsites and Camping Areas

Camping is a timeless and essential component of Wilderness recreation and consistent with Wilderness management. It seems reasonable and within the scope of the agency to either decrease or increase the number of campsites in the Park Wilderness based on various factors including, resource protection, wilderness quality or budgets during the life of the plan. Alternatives C & D capture this well. Alternative B seems to assume a reduction is in order without the justification of monitoring data. If there are individual campsites that are currently known to have issues, then suggesting a reduction of specific campsites would be appropriate in the Wilderness Stewardship Plan.

C. Commercial Services

Commercial services, like guided recreation opportunities, present an opportunity to overcome many of the challenges the Park faces in their Wilderness management. First, through permitting they can provide the face-to-face education of Leave No Trace principles that may be challenging for the agency to provide given existing budgets and capacity issues. Second, concerns about party size and, impacts to the resource and wilderness quality protection can be handled easily in the permitting for guides and commercial services. In many ways, monitoring the impact to the resource of commercial or guided trips in the Wilderness is much easier and more accountable than general public recreation. Finally, commercial outfitters provide an essential service in getting people

outside, particularly youth, who may not have the equipment, experience or knowledge to do so on their own. We support commercial services to the extent necessary as outlined in Alternative D, but in a manner that would not result in detrimental effects on natural resources or reduced opportunities for members of the general public. We feel that Alternative B would eliminate all the benefits commercial services provide, by limiting guiding and outfitting to only those with disabilities. Among the types of commercial services provided within ONP, we strongly recommend the inclusion of youth activities as an authorized activity in the Olympic Wilderness.

D. Permits

We understand that the park has an interest in improving the current permitting system which allows self-registration at the trailheads. This Wilderness Stewardship Plan offers the opportunity to more constructively monitor visitor use and potential impacts to wilderness quality than in the past. To that end, the online permitting system referenced in Alternative D has the benefit of improving information and organization of permitting over the current system while not discouraging Wilderness recreation and visitation. The online permitting system would also seem to have longterm positive budget implications requiring less staff time to process permits. A level of education about Leave No Trace and other principles for Wilderness use can be achieved at a level higher than that of self-registration (albeit less than face-to-face interaction). Online permitting should be supplemented by in-person registration available at one or more Ranger Stations for those unable to access or operate a computer or for certain zones or campsites that have quotas or require additional site specific information.

The in-person (or phone) permitting process suggested in Alternatives B & C poses a few concerns. First, this assumes that staffing levels would be higher than in the past to accommodate the increased time needed to provide permits in this fashion. Second, there is a concern that requiring visitors to connect with seasonal staff either in person or over the phone could lead to frustration if staffing is not sufficient to meet the demand. Finally, given the unique geography of Olympic National Park, in-person registration could actively deter recreational use. It seems prudent to proceed with an online permitting process that would increase the opportunities for education and still allow a reasonably accessible way for visitors to get a permit through select self-registration sites. These sites could be determined by existing monitoring data. If there are areas where there is existing monitoring data that indicates that certain areas require more in person education to avoid management issues that could be required for specific areas, if justified. During the life of the plan cycle, specific areas could be required to have more personal interaction with park staff if warranted and budgets allow.

E. Quotas and Use Limits

The current party size limit of 12 individuals is well established (both in National Parks and on National Forest Service land) for Wilderness areas. We recommend keeping this in place. Limiting party size to 6 or less in certain zones does not seem necessary until there is monitoring data that indicates there is a problem in a specific area. Additionally, a party size limit of 6 complicates management of visitor use, is potentially an enforcement burden and has the potential to confuse a public more familiar with the standard twelve-person group size limit. Additional regulations related to group size should only be implemented if there is a compelling need to do so.

We support Olympic National Park's prerogative to use quotas on specific trails or campsites to manage the Wilderness character as needed. There are several areas that have quotas on use now so this is not a new concept. The provisions in Alternative C & D seem reasonable and allow adaptive management of quota and use limits to protect the Wilderness quality when justified by monitoring data.

The provision in Alternative B that would establish quotas and use limits throughout the Wilderness seems broad and unjustified. We are concerned that this one-size-fits-all approach will have negative impacts on visitation and recreation. However, where monitoring data exists, trail or

campsite specific quotas are well within the purview of the park and could be implemented during the plan cycle.

Additionally, the alternatives reference potential quotas on day and overnight use. Permits for day use are utilized as a management tool in only a handful of very high use areas throughout the national park system. They include destination such as Half Dome in Yosemite National Park and The Narrows in Zion National Park. Day use quotas may be appropriate for areas of Olympic National Park in the future and the Wilderness Stewardship Plan should account for this possibility but any alternative that contemplates this approach needs to include specific criteria for implementing such a plan and guidelines that limit the application of this approach to specific areas with unique resource or social issues.

In general, we believe that quotas and use limits for overnight use are appropriate in high use areas when demand exceeds social or ecological capacity. As with day-use areas, quotas should not be applied without exceptional cause and justification.

F. Hiking and Stock Trails and Access

With rare exception, we believe that having a maintained trail system does not negatively impact the Wilderness character of the Park. We appreciate the current budget situation which makes it hard to envision adding new trails that would require additional maintenance given the challenge of maintaining existing trails. We agree also that a priority of additional trail mileage should be focused on trail reroutes. However, we recommend the CTAA that stipulates there would not be an increase in overall trail mileage, be adjusted to include the option of limited new trails. We can anticipate the possibility that there may be an opportunity for shorter day use trails, or the rebuild of historic trails, that may make sense to add to parts of the Wilderness over the next decade or longer (potentially the life of the plan). It seems unnecessary to preclude that opportunity even if any new trails remain an unlikely prospect due to budget or other factors.

We also encourage the Park to continue to utilize regional organizations that provide integral trail maintenance to the Park. For example, Washington Trails Association, Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, Student Conservation Association, and Public Lands Service Corps, as well as other small organizations, have provided thousands of volunteer hours.

Finally, we support the CTAA recommendation around American Disability Act compliant trails and access.

G. Food Storage

We encourage the use of Alternative A for food storage in ONP. For both human and animal safety, bear canisters and other means of safely storing food is a necessary requirement for over-night trips in the Olympic Wilderness. Though required use of bear canisters is a reasonable regulation for many activities and locations, requiring such use for all activities would severely eliminate or restrict access for some recreational users. For example, bear canisters do not physically fit in most hard shell whitewater kayaks and could potentially impact the ability to complete multi-day trips or alpine ascents. We believe that permit holders should be required to use proper food storage as currently outlined in the Camping and Food Storage section of the Superintendents Compendium and that depending on location, bear canisters, bear wires, bear hangs, and rodent proof food containers can all be used.

H. Campfire Restrictions

We believe that campfires can be an inspiring part of backcountry experiences and should be allowed in the Olympic Wilderness. However, it is essential that visitors understand the potential consequences of mishandling such a privilege. Similar to Alternative B, we suggest that campfires be prohibited above 3,500 feet due to the fragile nature of alpine environment. We support the Park in

being able to assess resource impacts below 3,500 feet including the coast, but we request more detailed language around what exceeding acceptable standards means.

V. Appropriate use of Minimum Tool in Wilderness

As you are aware, Section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act prohibits certain uses inconsistent with Wilderness (e.g., roads, motorized vehicle use, mechanical transport, etc.) but includes an exception for the minimum actions for administrative duties and emergency health and safety procedures. This agency discretion is an important tool that should be used carefully, but deliberately, to manage Wilderness areas. The Olympic National Park, like other land management agencies, has an adequate minimum tool analysis procedure to identify which actions merit this exception.

While not every trail repair, bridge replacement or search and rescue merit a minimum tool exception to use motorized equipment, there are management situations each year that may merit using this discretion.

We support the careful and prudent use of minimum tool in accordance with the current agency process. We are comforted to see that the draft alternatives appear to recognize and retain the careful use of minimum tool decisions.

VI. Conclusion

Thank you for moving forward with the Wilderness Stewardship Plan and process. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the preliminary draft alternatives. We hope the final outcome will balance the need to protect the unique and world-class wilderness characteristics of the Olympic Wilderness and ensure current and future generations are able to enjoy our wilderness heritage.

Correspondence ID:	1054	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Port Angeles Regional Chamber of Commerce Non-Governmental				
Affiliation:	OfficialRep				
Received:	May,16,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:				

The Port Angeles Regional Chamber of Commerce appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the Wilderness Stewardship Plan that is being considered for updates.

The Olympic Peninsula, and specifically Port Angeles, relies on the business diversity of the area to drive the region's economic engine, and Olympic National Park and the tourism generated from the 3 million park visits is vital to the region. For this reason we become concerned whenever there is a discussion about changing the current structure of access to the wilderness area.

With regard to the four alternatives being proposed, the Chamber would be most comfortable with option A or D.

Option A amounts to "change nothing," meaning that the way it is now is the way it will stay, which seems to be working.

Option D appears to have the goal of enhancing the wilderness experience for the backcountry visitors which is a positive, but does seem to fall short of what we would prefer, which would be to enhance the Olympic National Park experience for a higher percentage of the visitors to the area. Since the Chamber operates the Port Angeles Visitor Center, we receive a wealth of feedback from guests to the area. We often hear comments about having additional and ready access to sections of the park that are now only able to be reached via a backcountry adventure. We understand that these types of changes are not being considered at this time, but we did want to take this opportunity to mention this to you.

We encourage National Park officials to remember the economic impact Olympic National Park has on the local region's economy. We understand a mandate of the park is to preserve the natural environment for future generations, but sometimes the efforts toward preservation result in making decisions that keep people from enjoying what the park has to offer. A balanced approach is important.

Thank you again for allowing our comments to be heard.

Correspondence ID:	1055	Project:	29224	Document:	58015
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual				
Affiliation:					
Received:	May,21,2014 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Creachbaum and Olympic National Park Administration,				

Once again Olympic National Park (ONP) has opened itself up to public comment about the ongoing Wilderness Management Plan or Stewardship Plan as it is known in 2014. As an avid stockperson from the age of six, a member of the Back Country Horsemen of Washington and a newly retired trails employee of ONP, the preservation of the wilderness character of ONP has been extremely important to me since 1984, when I first started working here. After combing through the alternative management strategies presented on your website, I am prepared to offer my comment.

I will address things in the order presented in your preliminary draft which differs slightly from the Wilderness Management Plan of 2008. Within the overarching concept, it appears to me that ONP is already implementing many things that are cited in both alternatives C & D. For example, ONP already removes non-native plant species through the use of herbicides and manual extrication; reintroduction of extirpated species, such as the fisher; restoration of natural fire regimes, such as the 'let it burn policy', all listed under the concept description of Alternative C. ONP already protects natural resources through reducing visitor numbers in heavily impacted areas using the reservation system already established in the nine quota areas you have listed on your website, such as Seven Lakes Basin and Ozette areas, for two examples; there are already appropriate facilities such as designated trails, camps, bridges and signs; and there is already sport-fishing allowed as listed under the concept description of Alternative D. As far as Alternative B is concerned, there is only one redeeming quality that I believe could apply, that I will point out below. Olympic Park Associates' (OPA) interpretation of the Wilderness Act seemingly wants to see ONP locked up so it is totally inaccessible to man. This is not very satisfactory, since the purpose of the Wilderness Act is to protect the wilderness for the present and future use of the American people. I would like to see ONP practice education, conservation and preservation, not elimination.

As far as Natural Resources are concerned, it appears through the CTA(A)'s that public comment is not invited or welcomed since it pertains to all alternatives and is already being implemented. When it comes to the scientific research category, I would find Alternative B most appropriate for this category only. I have never approved of the manipulative practices that have gone on in the past, such as radio collaring & live capture. I believe it to be harassment and I find it intrusive, offensive and unnecessary. Employee training, education and interpretation are essential in preventing wildlife food habituation and visitor impact which in turn preserves wilderness character, not in manipulating ecosystems.

Cultural Resources: Once again, I see Alternative D already being implemented here. I do agree that the historic structures identified in the 2008 GMP List of Classified Structures should be protected and maintained, reconstructed if necessary, as listed under Alternative D. Several years ago, a new position was established- Backcountry Carpenter. This employee received extensive training specifically to rehabilitate these historic structures, keeping with their original construction. These employees made extensive repairs to the Hayes River Ranger Station, Enchanted Valley Chalet, Botten Cabin and several shelters: Wilder, Elk Lake and Bear Camp to name a few. An excellent job was done, using all native materials. Now, as of the winter of 2013/14, the Enchanted Valley Chalet, built in 1930, is in danger of falling into the Quinault River, as it has changed its course. Certainly, this is a cultural and historical structure worthy of relocating away from the river, not to mention its value for administrative use. The preservation of this or any historic structure will not undercut the preservation of wilderness character. OPA seems to believe that our backcountry structures are not worthy of any historical or cultural merit. The history of Park and Forest administrative structures is just as much a part of our history and culture as Native

American artifacts and shell middens. They will become even more so in our future generations. This is historical and cultural wilderness preservation.

Visitor Use and Experience: Currently, visitors of all levels of skills and abilities may find opportunities for a variety of wilderness experiences well within their reach. With nearly a million acres that comprise Olympic National Park, there already exists a 'community of life' with ample areas for visitors to experience solitude and a primitive wilderness experience. Commercial outfitter services are necessary to allow people whom might otherwise not be able, to access the backcountry. They also are beneficial to the local economy and the administration by assisting in SAR activities, packing supplies for backcountry crews, trail maintenance and hauling out garbage. The human use, as it exists now, is not standing in the way of healthy functioning ecosystems.

Stock Use: Of the 611 miles of trail in ONP, 365 miles are designated for stock- mules, horses, burros & llamas. In any given year this number is reduced due to natural processes or lack of funds not allowing the trail crews to meet the standards set for stock. This in no way should mean we lose those miles for stock; maintenance would be deferred until circumstances allowed for re-opening the trail for stock. OPA would have us believe that ONP has no management policies for stock, that they are running rampant, single-handedly destroying the high country and polluting the streams from merely crossing them. In reality, there have always been designated trails and camps. However, the stock regulations on your website are not clear, hard to find and confusing. I would like to see them re-written to make them more user-friendly. There have historically only been a handful of camps in the higher elevations: Home Sweet Home, Honeymoon Meadows, Low Divide, CB Flats & Cat Basin. CB Flats and Honeymoon Meadows are difficult to access due to current trail conditions. I suggest that the destruction of the high country that OPA is so concerned about comes from social trails created by camping hikers, not stock use. This is something that ONP has been battling for years in the Seven Lakes Basin area of the Sol Duc. If anything the facilities should be more user-friendly to ensure the least possible impact on natural resources. Restricting trails open to stock reduces the administration's ability to use non-motorized transport into the far reaches of the Park for trail maintenance, SAR, fire management, research and removal of human waste (blue bags). If maintaining trails to stock standards is good enough for administrative use, it is good enough for the private sector. Stock use is traditional and significant to the history of this Park and our country, they helped build what we have today. It should not be restricted any more than it already is. It is part of the cultural preservation of wilderness. The Backcountry Horsemen go out of their way to deliver proper education of Leave No Trace Principles to their membership. Perhaps ONP and OPA need to do the same for the hiking community.

Park Operations: The issue of chainsaws as the minimum tool has been justified ad nauseam in this park over recent years. Our Park has too many miles of trail, too many huge trees, too few crews and too short a season to suggest anything else.

Bridges, footlogs and puncheon are there for a good reason, to protect natural resources. They have already gone through a lengthy compliance process. When natural processes, decay or damage happens, they should be replaced. Some puncheon could be removed if turnpiking and proper drainage replaces it.

In conclusion, it appears to me that ONP is currently managing under Alternative D with options out of Alternative C. Everything is already being managed to federal and state laws, ONP Backcountry Management Plan of 1980, NPS management policies of 2006 and the existing ONP General Management Plan of 2008. Since that seems to be the case, my preferred alternative would be 'A'- do nothing more than you already are. I would like to see the Park concentrate its efforts in maintaining the roads, trails, facilities and backcountry structures we now have, as indicated in the 2008 GMP. I do not want to see any reduction of stock trails, camps, structures or facilities; I do not want to see a change in the minimum tool; I do not want to see a reduction in the outfitter concessionaires- they provide a great service to the recreational public and local economy. Creative funding such as NOVA and recreational grants, the continued use of volunteers such as BCH, WTA, SCA to name a few, would help with achieving our maintenance goals. There is already an extensive compliance and minimum requirement system in place. I see no need to make things more difficult to accomplish maintenance tasks. Let the maintenance crews and concessionaires do their jobs.

I implore you, ONP, to maintain and preserve Olympic's beautiful wilderness character for the enjoyment, education and inspiration for this and future generations. Alternative A sufficiently accomplishes this, because you are already doing it, leave it at status quo. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1056 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: May,23,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum,

I am believe the alternatives offered for public comment miss the mark. The PRESERVATION responsibility for Olympic National Park, which the National Park Service is charged, appears to have been given a great priority then has the responsibility "for public use, resort, and recreation." All alternatives are tilted away from enhanced availability for people. Clearly option A, do nothing, preserves the greatest access for the public.

I grew up on the Olympic Peninsula. As a scout, I hiking many of ONP trails and spent countless weekends skiing on the Ridge with friends. I returned after being gone for a decade to raise my family and start a new career. ONP was a significant part of that decision. We have hiked the mountains and beaches of my youth, and my children's first snow skiing experiences were on the same Ridge and water skiing on Lake Crescent, if memory serves me right.

These words of another reflect the hopes I have for my grandchildren;
"20 years from now I would ideally like to see in Olympic National Park:

- well maintained access roads, open year round;
- a full range of snow related activities on Hurricane Ridge in the winter, with advance certainty of being open and sufficient availability of cleared parking for all;
- a well maintained and expanded dirt trail network with safe bridges where necessary;
- additional access points into the Park for hikers at various points around the Park's perimeter;
- a Park culture that is friendly to those who want to use the Park for hiking, overnight camping, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, downhill skiing and snowboarding (on Hurricane Ridge), or horse packing trips (this includes availability of camp sites and reasonable and not overly restrictive rules as to campfires and waste management); and
- an expanded ranger led hike program

I believe the main issues in Olympic National Park are preserving and improving public access. The Park seems to be doing a good job with preservation. However, with limited budgets maintenance of, and repairs to, roads, trails, shelters and other visitor facilities have sometimes taken longer than ideal or not occurred at all. Until the Park can adequately maintain and preserve access to the area it already has it should not look to acquiring additional land.

I believe that the balance between use and preservation in Olympic National Park already has been tilted somewhat too much away from use and in favor of preservation. We have to be cautious that the Wilderness Stewardship Plan does not increase that imbalance by further, directly or indirectly, decreasing or hindering public access to the Park.

The NPS appropriately relies on the recognized benefit we each get from our parks. I believe the entire system is at risk of losing support when the average citizen feels and inability to USE THE PARK. This will happen as a result of "a million little cuts" should we allow a continued pattern of PRESERVATION responsibilities to trump USE responsibilities in our Parks. I certainly believe that is the direction of the 4 alternatives offered in the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan current under discussion.

Finally, there is no denying the communities on the Peninsula receive a significant economic value from the visitors to the Park. Something the Park has taken great pride in reporting over the years. That important form of public engagement is certainly enhanced when USE and access is valued as much as PRESERVATION in planning.

I appreciate having the opportunity for comment and thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 1057 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: Mar,18,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: â€¢ Do what we can to perpetuate fishing opps in the park
 â€¢ Maintain status quo of fisheries in high mtn lakes
 â€¢ Want to see Obstruction Pt. Rd. open on July 1
 â€¢ Improve trail from Sol Duc Falls to Deer Lake
 â€¢ Keep and replace bear wires
 â€¢ No pack goats
 â€¢ Stop gillnetting high mountain lakes
 â€¢ No wildlife collaring or tagging
 â€¢ Preference for Alt. A
 â€¢ Please keep bear wires where they haven't been a problem - don't want to carry the weight
 â€¢ Keep current # of trails and maintenance
 â€¢ Okay with tradeoffs of maintaining trails w/power tools
 â€¢ Like the CTAA list - addresses current and future issues
 â€¢ Confirm support for CTAA w/2 questions: 1) bear cans, 2) packing waste; urge transition period [for both]
 â€¢ Other features of value determination clarification - strongly supported
 â€¢ Supportive of no overflights (administrative and commercial)
 â€¢ Maintain access to fight fires (roads, trails)
 â€¢ Online registration is great and self-registration
 â€¢ Continue to have bear wires (esp. for kayaking)
 â€¢ Packing out human waste - not good option for kayakers; okay for subalpine and above
 â€¢ Concern about items that make things more difficult for users - such as bear cans, packing out of waste - provide place where bags could be obtained and deposited as well, don't go with online only permit process - have as an option along w/in-person (and self) registration

Correspondence ID: 1058 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,19,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Other

Correspondence: â€¢ I love the Park and want to see it protected. However, I do not see any alternative that reflects my vision for the Park. Why not adopt a policy to "maintain or restore wilderness character of the Park while, at the same time, maximize wilderness experience for maximum visitors." Other Parks are doing this: twin objectives. American people deserve better than options proposed.

Correspondence ID: 1059 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Mar,24,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Other

Correspondence: â€¢ Concern re self-registration and want to make sure park provides other ways to register w/out having to drive to a WIC
 â€¢ Park should look at putting in more toilets in high use areas; solar-powered incinerator as one suggestion
 â€¢ Anderson Pass shelter and Skyline shelter - please maintain for visitor safety needs
 â€¢ Follow Glacier National Park model of backcountry food preparation and storage
 â€¢ Bio bags encouraged above 5500' instead of 3500'
 â€¢ Want the NPS to come up with a solution instead of requiring bear cans; bear wires are a bad idea; bear boxes would be a better idea
 â€¢ Encourage visitors to carry out not only their own trash but other peoples' trash too
 â€¢ Day hikers are causing more impacts than compensated for (they are not charged fees like the backpackers) - big issue - backpackers are paying for backcountry maintenance but day users causing impacts and not paying for them

Correspondence ID: 1060 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:

Received: Mar,26,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: (All notes taken were from a small group discussion and not related to the wilderness plan)

â€¢ North Shore property purchase by park (taking out of tax base/inflated purchase price)
â€¢ Houses that are purchased need to be cleaned up - 991 North Shore
â€¢ July Creek - new picnic tables etc.
â€¢ Learn about Walgren Bill

Correspondence ID: 1061 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Apr,01,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: â€¢ ONP should provide tables showing the specific trails and their mileage that would be affected by reduced, or no, maintenance under each option
â€¢ The Wilderness Plan should favor increased human access into the park with easier permitting, smooth trail maintenance, and youth friendly orientation
â€¢ Instead of "no new trails" consider the phrase "no net gain" - many scenarios where a new trail might be necessary - new route to lake, skirting a burned area, etc.

Correspondence ID: 1062 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Affiliation:
Received: Jun,05,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: -Reconsider educational component of permitting process given non-English speaking visitors, access to computer-based education.

-Administrative access on trails especially regarding resource management and protection

-Development (potential) of designated campsites in regard to Alt. D and dispersed use and quotas - designated campsites assumes level of development

Correspondence ID: 1063 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: USFWS Federal Government
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Apr,22,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Subject: Comments on Preliminary Draft Alternatives for Olympic National Park's Wilderness Stewardship Plan

These comments are in response to your March 2014 newsletter and additional information provided on-line (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/olymwild>, accessed April 15, 2014). We appreciate the early coordination and opportunity to provide input.

In providing these comments, we recognize the mission of the National Park Service is to preserve multiple values including wildlife for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. As such, wildlife is not the only consideration. In addition, we recognize the constraints of various Federal statutes such as the Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1131-1136) and the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1, 2, 3, and 4). Because of these constraints, the reasonable alternatives considered may be limited. On the other hand, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 USCÂ§ 4321-4375), establishes requirements for considering a full range of reasonable alternatives. Given the early stage of planning under NEPA, the alternatives presented seem to comport with all requirements.

We do note that there is often some difficulty in describing the differences between alternatives when the differences are small. We believe you may face such difficulties as you proceed with planning. In this case, many factors are common to all action alternatives or even all alternatives (including the no-action alternative). Other factors, while different, may be different in subtle ways that could be lost to the average reader. We encourage you to focus on methods and techniques to highlight the meaningful differences to the average reader.

As a general comment, we encourage the continued emphasis on maintaining viable populations of wildlife by maintaining natural and undisturbed habitat and natural ecosystem functions as you develop your preferred alternative.

At this time, we provide five general comments:

1. We encourage you to decrease and minimize the use of motorized equipment (e.g., chainsaws, pumps, and helicopters) in your operations and maintenance. We suggest using the minimum level of motorized equipment needed to accomplish your mission. Such use should be undertaken only after careful analysis and consideration.
2. Fires are a natural ecosystem process important for habitats of many wildlife species. We recommend maintaining a natural fire regime. In some cases (e.g., where past management or fire suppression has resulted in overly dense vegetation or on the margins of facilities and developments), transitioning to such a natural fire regime may require management to prepare for fires. These management actions may include fuels reductions, fire breaks, or other silvicultural practices to accommodate transition to a natural regime that otherwise may have extreme consequences. This preparation may also include prescribed burns or silvicultural preparation for prescribed burns. We encourage use of these tools as necessary to accomplish the goals of a natural fire regime and natural landscapes.
3. Fire suppression and other factors have resulted in loss of prairie habitats over the course of many decades. We encourage the restoration of these important habitats for both their wildlife values and their cultural values. Restoration of prairie habitats may require a combination of silvicultural treatment and prescribed fire. Such restoration is critically important to a number of imperiled species.
4. We believe that manipulative wildlife research, such as capturing and marking wild animals or using radio telemetry, is consistent with the management of these areas provided that there are no permanent facilities or infrastructure established in wilderness as a result. We hope that you would maintain manipulative wildlife research as an option within wilderness areas as you develop the preferred alternative.
5. We assume you will wait until a preferred alternative has been drafted before initiating consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. Â§ 1531 et seq.). This will allow us to focus on one alternative and prevent needless consideration of scenarios that may be otherwise dismissed. However, we are available to assist you in the meantime.

In summary, your current reasonable range of alternatives seems sufficient given your statutory constraints. You provide a substantial amount of information that will hopefully become easier to understand as your planning process proceeds. We undoubtedly will have additional questions and/or comments in later phases of your planning. Please keep us informed as you proceed with this planning process.

If you have any questions about this letter or our joint responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act, please contact Bill Vogel at (360) 753-4367 (email: bill_vogel@fws.gov) or Carolyn Scafidi at (360) 753-4068, of this office.

Correspondence ID: 1064 **Project:** 29224 **Document:** 58015
Outside Organization: Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary/NOAA Federal Government
Affiliation: OfficialRep
Received: Jun,06,2014 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:

In 1988, at the time the National Marine Sanctuary Act was reauthorized, Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to designate the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS or sanctuary). In report language accompanying this legislation, Congress noted that one of the characteristics that made this marine area nationally significant and deserving of designation was the adjacency of Olympic National Park (ONP). The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) completed the designation process in 1994. Congress also designated the Olympic Wilderness in 1988, including the 73-mile long wilderness coast. The adjacency in time and space of these designations show the importance of the Olympic Coast to the nation and highlights the need for NOAA and the National Park Service (NPS) to work collaboratively to protect this special place. OCNMS supports your wilderness planning efforts and are pleased to provide the following comments on the Olympic National Park Wilderness Stewardship Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (WSP/EIS).

The boundary of the sanctuary extends to the Mean Higher High Tide line where adjacent to federal lands. Specifically the intertidal area of Olympic National Park (ONP) overlaps with sanctuary boundaries (15 CFR Â§922.150). Our comments concentrate on those areas of the WSP/EIS where OCNMS has either direct geographic responsibilities or programmatic areas where we have an interest.

Scientific Research Using Emerging Technologies

OCNMS is interested in the use of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) for the monitoring of marine wildlife species and for responding to natural resource emergencies. In 2014 we conducted an evaluation of this technology in partnership with USFWS Washington Maritime National Wildlife Refuge Complex (refuge). We request that ONP evaluate the use of this new technology as part of the WSP/EIS. UAS systems have many advantages to helicopter and fixed wing aircraft-based surveys currently being used for wildlife surveys on the outer coast. These benefits include minimal impact to the wilderness quality of the coast in comparison to the far noisier and less safe manned aircraft, while still maintaining agencies ability to monitor key species in a cost effective manner and also in a manner which minimizes the risk to personnel. We recommend that UAS specifically be included in the alternatives under "Wildlife Management: Native Species" or "Aircraft Use". Sanctuary and refuge staffs have completed a preliminary evaluation of potential shore launch sites in ONP that could be used in such an analysis. In addition, UAS may have potential benefits for monitoring catastrophic coastal events such as oil spills noted below.

Wildlife Management

OCNMS recommends that a discussion of marine mammal strandings on ONP wilderness shoreline be addressed in the WSP/EIS. Issues could include a discussion of appropriate responses for both live and dead strandings and if strandings of endangered species warrant a more aggressive response.

Interpretation /Education

We request that when evaluating alternatives related to "Commercial Services", "Quotas & Use Limits" and "Ranger-led hikes/programs" you take into consideration the value of experiential educational experiences in promoting stewardship of our shared resources. We request that changes to quotas and limits for day use be evaluated in the context of maintaining a balance between the wilderness character of the coast and being able to deliver services to larger groups, e.g., school groups.

Wilderness Trailhead Exhibits

We request you consider sanctuary resources and issues when developing area-specific messages at coastal trailhead exhibits. Due to the nature of the sanctuary, we are dependent on partners for signage projects. We request to be involved in use messaging for areas where we share resources.

Emergency Response

OCNMS considers the risk of a catastrophic oil spill to be the greatest single threat to sanctuary resources. We have been very fortunate that a major oil spill has not occurred on the coast since the Tenyo Maru oil spill of 1991. Since that time there have been several improvements to maritime safety off the Olympic Coast. Despite this fact we need to continue to be prepared to respond to an oil spill. Such a response would be logistically difficult in the ONP wilderness. We see that common to all alternatives is the development of an emergency response standard operating procedure. We recommend that ONP consider how such a plan would fit into the existing Northwest Area Contingency Plan and serve to minimize any delays in responding to a spill. There are other emergencies that could also be considered in the emergency response standard operating procedure, such as an unusual stranding event, e.g., the mass seabird live and dead strandings that occurred on the coast in September 2009.

Marine Debris

One of the largest detriments to the wilderness character of the ONP coastal strip is the wide spread presence of marine debris deposited either from land or the ocean. This is also a major natural resource protection issue. OCNMS has been very active in working with ONP, tribes and non-government organizations in addressing this issue. We appreciate that this has risen to its own topic in the WSP/EIS, but believe some additional removal methods should be evaluated in the alternatives. The use of volunteers to collect and carry out marine debris is common to all alternatives. While this will undoubtedly continue to be part of how we collectively deal with this issue, we recommend that more proactive alternatives be considered in the WSP/EIS. These alternatives should include the use of paid crews, helicopter sling loads, and/or removal by sea, when the weight, volume of debris or the remote nature of certain beaches precludes carrying out the debris.

New Topic: Climate Change

Given the importance of climate change to the future condition of ONP wilderness we recommend that you consider making this its own topic in the WSP/EIS.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan and look forward to continuing to support your efforts through our role as a cooperating agency in the development of the WSP/EIS.
