



Final Disposition of the Enchanted Valley Chalet Environmental Assessment

Appendices



NPS Photo: May 2020

Table of Contents

Appendix A: Impact Topics Dismissed from Further Analysis	3
Appendix B: Mitigation Measures	5
Appendix C: Minimum Requirement Analysis	7
Appendix D: Consultation Letters	32

Appendix A: Impact Topics Dismissed from Further Analysis

The following topics have been dismissed from further analysis.

Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations, requires all federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs and policies on minorities and low-income populations and communities. The proposed action would not result in significant changes in the socioeconomic environment of the area, and therefore would have no direct or indirect impacts to minority or low-income populations or communities.

Indian Trust Resources

Secretarial Order 3175 requires that anticipated impacts to Indian trust resources from a proposed project or action by Department of Interior agencies be explicitly addressed in environmental documents. The federal Indian trust responsibility is a legally enforceable fiduciary obligation on the part of the United States to protect tribal lands, assets, resources, and treaty rights, and it represents a duty to carry out the mandates of federal law with respect to American Indian and Alaska Native tribes. There are no Indian trust resources at Olympic National Park, therefore this topic is dismissed from further analysis. While there are no Indian trust resources to consider, “treaty” resources (e.g., fish) are being evaluated separately from Indian trust resources (see “Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat” and “Special Status Species”).

Soils and Geology

Soils in the project area are generally unconsolidated and weakly developed. Most of the surface geology at the project site consists of thick, recent alluvial deposits typical of an active floodplain. Within the Quinault River, the streambed is composed mostly of gravel to cobble-sized material, with some sand and silt. Actions in the project area would have minimal effects on soils and geology, therefore this topic was dismissed from further analysis.

Vegetation

The herbaceous terrace vegetation reflects the recent history of pack stock grazing in that the meadows contain many exotic species. No more than 12, mature (approximately 72” or less in diameter, with only one or two possibly close to this size) cottonwood and/or alder trees would need to be removed under alternative D, however, this would have minimal effects on overall vegetation in the project area. Therefore, this topic has been dismissed from further analysis.

Wetlands

While there are areas of standing water, there are no jurisdictional wetlands within the project area. The current banks of the river are too new for riverine vegetation to have developed. Most of the area wetlands are on river right, opposite the chalet on river left, therefore this topic has been dismissed from further analysis.

Floodplains

While the chalet currently rests on the floodplain within the Enchanted Valley, and under alternative D would require some landscape modifications (no more than 12 alder or cottonwood trees would be removed, and there may be a need for some minor leveling that could be done by hand), there would be no long-term, noticeable impacts on the floodplain. Therefore, this topic has been dismissed from further analysis.

Archeological Resources

In the fall of 2002 ONP archeologists recorded an archeological site directly associated with the historic Enchanted Valley Chalet. The site area as defined in 2002 encompasses the chalet and three archeological features identified at that time. Channel migration of the Quinault River since 2002 has completely eroded all three of these features. Small scale archeological survey projects associated with park operations have not turned up pre-contact archeological resources in the valley. Due to the dynamic nature of the Quinault River, there appears to be very little potential for encountering intact, pre-contact archeological resources during potential activities associated with the alternatives. Therefore, this topic has been dismissed from further analysis.

Appendix B: Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures have been applied to each resource topic under the *Environmental Consequences* section. These measures have been identified to lessen the potential adverse impacts of the action alternatives. In addition, the following measures also include those identified in the GMP for the same resource topics. Other measures in the GMP, such as for night skies, wetlands, and soils, are not specifically applicable to the proposed project to determine the final disposition of the Enchanted Valley Chalet. There are no mitigation measures identified in the GMP for visitor use and experience.

Historic Structure

- See the 2014 MOA for existing mitigation measures. Additional mitigations to be determined in consultation with the WA SHPO, ACP and other consulting parties.

Ethnographic Resources

- Mitigations to be determined in consultation with affected tribes.

Wilderness Character

- The minimum requirement analysis process would be applied to all management actions, programs, and activities within the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness, as required by NPS *Management Policies 2006*.
- Use the smallest, quietest helicopter practicable.

Fish and Wildlife

- Employ techniques to reduce impacts on fish and wildlife, including visitor education programs, restrictions on visitor and park activities, and law enforcement patrols.
- Use the smallest, quietest helicopter practicable.
- In-water work would be avoided.

Special Status Species

- Locate and design facilities/actions/operations to avoid or minimize the removal of rare, threatened, and endangered species habitat. If avoidance is infeasible, minimize and compensate for adverse effects as appropriate and in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies.
- For projects in or near streams, employ appropriate best management practices.
- From the effects tables (in the 2008 GMP and Biological Opinion), use of a Type III helicopter (i.e., Bell Jet Ranger), or similar sized helicopter, is *not likely to adversely affect* either of the threatened and endangered species (marbled murrelets and spotted owls), if it is >120 yards from suitable habitat. If a larger helicopter is necessary, formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, per Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, will be required and additional NEPA review may be required.
- To mitigate impacts to marbled murrelets, which fly to and from the sea more frequently at dawn and dusk during early nesting season (April 1 through August 5) helicopter operations would be restricted to Limited Operating Periods (LOPs) which are > 2 hours after sunrise to < 2 hours before sunset.

- **Bunch Field:** The primary grassy opening in Bunch Field is approximately 536 by 109 yards wide, and is surrounded by deciduous trees, with a few conifers that are not suitable murrelet or spotted owl habitat, with the Quinault River immediately to the south (see figure 1). There is suitable murrelet habitat near the northern edge of the field. However, in the middle of the widest part of the meadow, the closest patch of suitable murrelet habitat is over 131 yards away. The helicopter will land and stage at the spot indicated, and gain elevation by heading south, overflying the meadow, alder stand, and the river, and therefore will be able to maintain sufficient distance to *not likely to adversely affect* either murrelets or spotted owls.
- **Enchanted Valley:** At Enchanted Valley the suitable habitat is on the valley walls, with the most substantial and closest patch on the east side of the valley. The helicopter will gain (and lose) elevation up-valley, and towards the western wall (over gravel bars and deciduous forest) which will allow sufficient room to stay > 120 yards from the habitat on the valley wall (see figure 2). If the helicopter needs to land, there are open areas near the river, on the gravel bars, that are > 120 yards from marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl habitat.

Water Resources

- Implement erosion control measures, minimize discharge to water bodies, and regularly inspect construction equipment for leaks of petroleum and other chemicals to prevent water pollution.

Soundscapes

- Implement standard noise abatement measures during the project, including: scheduling to minimize impacts in noise-sensitive areas, using the best available noise control techniques wherever feasible, minimizing the use of motorized tools, using hydraulically or electrically powered tools when feasible, and locating stationary noise sources as far from sensitive uses as possible.
- Use the smallest, quietest helicopter practicable.



Visitor Use and Experience

- Use the smallest, quietest helicopter practicable.

Appendix C: Minimum Requirement Analysis

<p>Olympic National Park</p> <p>Wilderness Project Proposal Form and Minimum Requirements Worksheet</p>	
---	---

PART ONE: Wilderness Project Proposal Information	
Project Originator(s):	Superintendent Sarah Creachbaum
Division:	Superintendent's Division
MRW Preparer:	Christina Miller
Date:	Original draft 3.22.19; Revised 10.24.19 and 3.23.20; the final signed version will be included with the decision document
PMIS #:	None
PEPC #:	64240
What is the <u>issue</u> or <u>problem</u> to be solved?	<p>The Enchanted Valley Chalet, a two and a half story, 42' x 28' structure, was built in 1930-31 as a commercial business, prior to the park's establishment. Beginning in the mid-1950s it was used as a ranger station and starting in the mid-1990s one room of the building was apportioned as an emergency public shelter. In 1988, 95% of the park was designated as wilderness, including the Enchanted Valley. The chalet was added to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 2007 due to its local significance.</p> <p>The chalet is located on the active floodplain of the Quinault River and in January 2014 had migrated to within 18 inches of the building. The NPS released the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the "Emergency Action to Temporarily Relocate the Enchanted Valley Chalet for the Protection of the East Fork Quinault River/Concise Environmental Assessment" in July 2014, and the chalet was moved that fall approximately 100 feet away from the bank of the Quinault River. Riverbank erosion continued and as of fall 2019 the nearest edge of the bank was approximately 5 feet from the chalet.</p>
What is the underlying need for the project?	In 2014, under the emergency action EA to move the chalet for the protection of the Quinault River, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was developed with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The MOA stated that once the chalet had been relocated, a long-term decision would be made through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and

	National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) processes as to its final disposition.
Location (attach map and/or photos):	The Enchanted Valley Chalet is located 13 miles up the Quinault River from the Graves Creek Trailhead, at an approximate elevation of 2,030 feet, within the congressionally designated Daniel J. Evans Wilderness (designated in 1988 as the Olympic Wilderness). See Figure 1 in Chapter 1 of the EA for map.
	
Enchanted Valley Chalet, April 2018	Enchanted Valley, April 2018
Is resolution of this issue addressed in an approved NEPA document: Categorical Exclusion (CE); Environmental Assessment, Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI); or Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision (ROD)? If so, please name:	No. However, actions related to historic structures in wilderness are generally addressed in the park's 2008 GMP, which states (Volume 1, page 149), "Historic structures that have been included within wilderness would be protected and maintained according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources using management methods that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values. Laws pertaining to historic preservation remain applicable within wilderness but must generally be administered to preserve the area's wilderness character (16 USC 1133(a)(3)). The responsible decision-maker would include appropriate consideration of the application of the provisions of the Wilderness Act in analyses and decision-making concerning cultural resources."
What would happen if the need were not met? (NO ACTION)	The 2014 MOA expired in August 2019. SHPO consultation has been be reinitiated toward the development of a new MOA. If no long-term decision is made on the final disposition of the Enchanted Valley Chalet, the structure would likely fall into the river.

Wilderness Minimum Requirement Analysis (MRA)	
STEP ONE: Determine if action is necessary or appropriate	
1	<div>Is the resolution of this issue covered by an existing Wilderness Plan or other NEPA decision document that includes</div> <div>Answer: Yes_____ No___X___</div>

wilderness minimum requirement considerations?		
Yes	No	If "Yes" provide name of document and approval date:
Implement action as approved	Continue PPF/MRA	
2	Has Superintendent determined this is an emergency in accordance with law & policy?	Answer: Yes____ No __X__
	No	Yes, follow approved emergency SOPs/management plans. If they do not exist or have not gone through MRA, continue MRA.

3	List guidance provided in law and policy for resolution of the issue	See Management Policies Chapter 6, Director's Order #41 and other applicable laws, policies and directives. Add additional policy guidance as appropriate.
---	--	--

WILDERNESS MINIMUM REQUIREMENT

Wilderness Act of 1964 - Prohibition Of Certain Uses Section 4(c) Except as specifically provided for in this Act, and subject to existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise and no permanent road within any wilderness area designated by this Act and except as necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area.

NPS Management Policies 2006, § 6.3.5 Minimum Requirement

All management decisions affecting wilderness must be consistent with the minimum requirement concept. This concept is a documented process used to determine if administrative actions, projects, or programs undertaken by the Service or its agents and affecting wilderness character, resources, or the visitor experience are necessary, and if so how to minimize impacts. The minimum requirement concept will be applied as a two-step process that determines whether the proposed management action is appropriate or necessary for administration of the area as wilderness and does not cause a significant impact to wilderness resources and character, in accordance with the Wilderness Act; and the techniques and types of equipment needed to ensure that impacts on wilderness resources and character are minimized.

In accordance with this policy, superintendents will apply the minimum requirement concept in the context of wilderness stewardship planning, as well as to all other administrative practices, proposed special uses, scientific activities, and equipment use in wilderness. The only exception to the minimum requirement policy is for eligible areas that the Service has not proposed for wilderness designation. However, those lands will still be managed to preserve their eligibility.

When determining minimum requirements, the potential disruption of wilderness character and resources will be considered before, and given significantly more weight than, economic efficiency and convenience.

If a compromise of wilderness resources or character is unavoidable, only those actions that preserve wilderness character and/or have localized, short-term adverse impacts will be acceptable.

Although park managers have flexibility in identifying the method used to determine minimum requirement, the method used must clearly weigh the benefits and impacts of the proposal, document the decision-making process, and be supported by an appropriate environmental compliance document. Parks must develop a process to determine minimum requirement until the plan is finally approved. Parks will complete a minimum requirement analysis on those administrative practices and equipment uses that have the potential to impact wilderness resources or values. The minimum requirement concept cannot be used to rationalize permanent roads or inappropriate or unlawful uses in wilderness.

Administrative use of motorized equipment or mechanical transport will be authorized only

- if determined by the superintendent to be the minimum requirement needed by management to achieve the purposes of the area, including the preservation of wilderness character and values, in accordance with the Wilderness Act; or
- in emergency situations (for example, search and rescue, homeland security, law enforcement) involving the health or safety of persons actually within the area.

Such management activities will also be conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations, policies, and guidelines and, where practicable, will be scheduled to avoid creating adverse resource impacts or conflicts with visitor use.

While actions taken to address search and rescue, homeland security and law enforcement issues are subject to the minimum requirement concept, preplanning or programmatic planning should be undertaken whenever possible to facilitate a fast and effective response and reduce paperwork.

For more detailed guidance, see Director's Order #41 and the National Wilderness Steering Committee Guidance Paper #3: "What Constitutes the Minimum Requirements in Wilderness?"

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

"The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) expresses a general policy of supporting and encouraging the preservation of prehistoric and historic resources for present and future generations, directing Federal agencies to assume responsibility for considering such resources in their activities. NHPA does not mandate preservation of such resources but requires Federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on historic properties. The statute sets forth a multifaceted preservation scheme to accomplish these policies and mandates at the State and Federal levels."

Section 106 (16 USC 470f) of the NHPA states:

The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department of independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established under Title II of this Act a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking.

Additionally, "As passed in 1980, Section 110 established procedures for Federal agencies managing or controlling property. Among other things, agencies must assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties under their jurisdiction and, to the maximum extent feasible, use historic properties available to the agency. Additionally, Federal agencies were directed to carry out their programs and projects in accordance with the purposes of NHPA. Further, Section 110(f) requires that, prior to the approval of any Federal undertaking that may directly and adversely affect any National Historic

Landmark, agencies must undertake such planning and action as may be necessary to minimize harm to the landmark and obtain Council comments on the undertaking. The review required by Section 110(f) is similar to that required under Section 106 but involves a higher standard of care. Generally, Section 110(f) review is accomplished under the Council's procedures implementing Section 106."

Furthermore, the NPS utilizes *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* for guidance in the preservation maintenance of historic structures. The Standards are neither technical nor prescriptive, but are intended to promote responsible preservation practices and provide philosophical consistency to the work. The treatments include Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. Choosing the most appropriate treatment for a historic structure requires careful decision-making about its historical significance as well as its relative importance in history, physical condition, proposed use, and mandated code requirements.

NPS Management Policies 2006

Chapter 5 - Cultural Resource Management

Cultural resource management will be carried out in a manner that is consistent with the legislative and regulatory provisions that can be found in the Cultural Resource Management Handbook issued pursuant to Director's Order #28 and with implementing policies and procedures such as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 Federal Register (FR) 44716-740), and Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation Programs Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (63 FR 20497-508).

5.3.5.4 Historic and Prehistoric Structures

The treatment of historic and prehistoric structures will be based on sound preservation practice to enable the long-term preservation of a structure's historic features, materials, and qualities. There are three types of treatment for extant structures: preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration.

5.3.5.4.5 Movement of Historic Structures

Proposals for moving historic structures will consider the effects of movement on the structures, their present environments, their proposed environments, and the archeological research value of the structures and their sites. No historic structure will be moved if its preservation would be adversely affected or until the appropriate recovery of significant archeological data has occurred.

A historic structure of less-than-national significance may be moved if

- It cannot practically be preserved on its present site; or
- Its present location is not important to its significance, and its relocation is essential to public understanding of the park's cultural associations.

In moving a historic structure, every effort will be made to reestablish its historic orientation, immediate setting, and general relationship to its environment.

6.3.8 Cultural Resources

The Wilderness Act specifies that the designation of any area of the park system as wilderness "shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of" such unit of the park system under the various laws applicable to that unit (16 USC 1133(a)(3)). Thus, the laws pertaining to historic preservation also remain applicable within wilderness but must generally be administered to preserve the area's wilderness character. The responsible decision-maker will include appropriate consideration of the application of these provisions of the Wilderness Act in analyses and decision-making concerning cultural resources.

Cultural resources 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 the preservation of wilderness character and values. These laws include the Antiquities Act and the Historic Sites, Buildings and Antiquities Act, as well as subsequent historic preservation legislation, including the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act,

and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation projects provide direction for protection and maintenance. Cemeteries or commemorative features, such as plaques or memorials, that have been included in wilderness may be retained (including approved access to these sites), but no new cemeteries or additions to existing cemeteries may be made unless specifically authorized by federal statute, existing reservations, or retained rights.

2008 Olympic National Park General Management Plan

Chapter 1: Introduction, Parkwide Policies and Desired Conditions, (page 32).

Cultural Resources 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 the preservation of wilderness character and values.

Wilderness management is based on the minimum requirement concept, allowing only those actions necessary and appropriate for administration of the area as wilderness and that do not cause a significant impact to wilderness resources and character. Implementation of such actions is done using techniques and types of equipment necessary to ensure that impacts on wilderness resources and character are minimized (page 32).

Chapter 2: Alternatives, Including the Preferred Alternative, General Description of the Alternatives, Alternative D – Management Preferred, pg 81

Structures and cultural landscapes listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places would be preserved and rehabilitated to retain a high degree of integrity and would be managed in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Some historic structures might be adaptively reused to achieve preservation and/or administrative objectives. The park staff would develop a strategy for the maintenance and preservation of historic structures using the existing list of classified structures (see appendix E) and ongoing cultural resource assessments of condition and history.

Cultural resources that have been included within wilderness would be protected and maintained according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources using management methods consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values. Laws pertaining to historic preservation remain applicable within wilderness but must generally be administered to preserve the area's wilderness character. 16USC 1133(a)(3). The responsible decision-maker would include appropriate consideration of the application of the provisions of the Wilderness Act in analyses and decision-making concerning cultural resources.

Chapter 2: Alternatives, Including the Preferred Alternative, Management and Protection of Cultural Resources, pgs 147 and 149

The protection of Olympic National Park's cultural resources is essential for understanding the past, present, and future relationship of people with the park environment and the expressions of our cultural heritage. The park would pursue strategies to protect its cultural resources, including museum collection and archeological, historic, ethnographic, and archival resources, while encouraging visitors and employees to recognize and understand their value. The strategies would allow the integrity of the park's cultural resources to be preserved unimpaired. They would also ensure that Olympic National Park is recognized and valued as an outstanding example of resource stewardship, conservation education and research, and public use. (page 147).

Some of the park cultural resources are within designated wilderness. The Wilderness Act specifies that the designation of any area of the park system as wilderness "shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of" such unit of the park system under the various laws applicable to that unit (16 USC 1133 (a) (3)). Thus, the laws pertaining to historic preservation also remain applicable within wilderness but must generally be administered to preserve the area's wilderness character. In accordance with NPS management policies, cultural resources that have been included in wilderness would be protected and maintained according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural

resources, using management methods that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values (6.3.8) (page 147).

Historic structures that have been included within wilderness would be protected and maintained according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources using management methods that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values. Laws pertaining to historic preservation remain applicable within wilderness but must generally be administered to preserve the area's wilderness character (16 USC 1133 (a) (3)). The responsible decision-maker would include appropriate consideration of the application of the provisions of the Wilderness Act in analyses and decision-making concerning cultural resources (page, 149).

4	Is resolution of this issue necessary or appropriate to meet wilderness management objectives or the requirements of other laws, policies and directives?	Answer: Yes__X__ No__
	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Do not proceed with action</p>	<p>Explain:</p> <p>NPS Management Policies and Olympic National Park's 2008 General Management Plan direct that cultural resources that have been included within wilderness are to be protected and maintained according to the pertinent laws and policies governing cultural resources using management methods that are consistent with the preservation of wilderness character and values. The Enchanted Valley Chalet is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Wilderness Act requires the preservation of wilderness character. If the riverbank continues to erode, the multi-story structure would end up in the river, negatively impacting some of the qualities of wilderness character.</p>
5	Can the issue be resolved through visitor education?	Answer: Yes__ No__X__
	<p>Yes</p> <p>Carry out visitor education</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Explain:</p> <p>Visitor education can help inform visitors about the issue, but would not resolve the issue of determining the final disposition of the Enchanted Valley Chalet.</p>
6	Can the issue be resolved through actions outside of wilderness?	Answer: Yes__ No__X__
	<p>Yes</p> <p>Conduct actions outside wilderness</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Explain:</p> <p>The site is located in the wilderness and thus alternatives to address the final disposition of the structure would need to be implemented within the wilderness area.</p>

I have reviewed this project proposal and have determined that it meets the overall goals of Olympic National Park and can be included in my divisional work plan. I have designated a project coordinator below to represent my division and present the proposal to the Compliance Council.

Project Manager:

Division Chief Signature:

Date:

Next step:

Contact the Planning & Compliance Office to schedule the issue for discussion by the Olympic National Park Compliance Council.

I have reviewed this project proposal and have determined that the proposed management action is appropriate or necessary for administration of the park, if in wilderness it is appropriate and necessary for the administration of the area as wilderness, in accordance with the Wilderness Act. I recommend that alternatives be developed to ensure that actions taken would not cause a significant impact to wilderness resources or character, and to develop techniques and types of equipment needed to ensure that impacts on park resources and values, and wilderness resources and character are avoided or minimized. Complete Part Two (next page).

Deputy Superintendent:

Date:

PART TWO: Evaluate Alternatives, as appropriate determine the minimum tools, techniques and actions that would effectively resolve the issue while avoiding or minimizing adverse effects.

8

Describe in detail alternative ways to resolve the issue (include use of minimum tools as appropriate)

Note: Alternatives described in other compliance documents that address this issue may be referenced. If minimum requirement considerations were not

Questions to answer for each alternative:

- What is proposed?
- Does the proposed action involve new construction or repair/rehab to existing structures/utilities/assets?
- Does the project take place in the same location/footprint/trench used before, or in a previously undisturbed area?
- Would the project involve ground disturbance (cut or fill)? If so, how many cubic yards and where would materials be deposited (both temporarily and permanently)? If fill materials are taken, identify the specific site fill taken from and if the materials are native to the park. How would fill be "stored"?
- How much excavation would be necessary (quantify by width, length, depth, cubic feet, number or lines, etc.)?
- Would the proposal involve work in or near a known archeological site or other historic property?
- Would a staging area be required? If so, identify staging area(s), include map, what type of materials and/or equipment and for how long? What would be the estimated square footage of the staging area?
- How/where would construction debris be disposed of?
- How much surface area would be disturbed, cleared, or denuded of vegetation (quantify by square footage, # of trees removed, etc.)?
- Would the project involve any geologic or hydrologic features/alter stream courses, surface or ground water flow?
- Would the proposal involve structures, fill, or discharge into water (example: bridge crossing, boardwalk, gravel, culverts, etc.)?
- Would the proposal affect water quality or quantity?
- What changes would occur in land/facility use?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What changes would occur to traffic flow or visitor circulation? • Would the proposal require aerial operations? • Would the proposal alter visitor services, activities, or experiences? • Where would the action take place? • When would the action take place? • What design and standards would apply? • What methods, tools and techniques would be used? • How long would it take to complete the action? • What mitigation measures would be taken to minimize action impacts on park resources and values, and wilderness resources and character (where applicable)?
--	--

Alternative A: No action – The chalet would remain in its current location atop the steel I-beams.

- What is proposed?
 - The chalet would remain in its current location and on top of the steel I-beams that were used to move it in 2014. Also, it would remain closed to public and administrative use. No action would be taken to protect the chalet from the river, or the river from the chalet, and no maintenance activities would occur. Should damage occur to the chalet from natural hazards (such as, but not limited to, river encroachment, avalanche, lightning strike, flooding, tree fall, or fire), the damage would not be repaired. Additional compliance (NEPA and wilderness minimum requirements analysis) and consultation would be necessary if river encroachment causes the building to fall into the river. The building materials and I-beams would be removed only if it can be done safely.
 - The 2014 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) expired in August 2019. The park would continue to re-consult until a new MOA is completed. Remaining items of historic importance that were identified in the MOA may be packed out by staff or pack stock.
- Does the proposed action involve new construction or repair/rehab to existing structures/utilities/assets?
 - No.
- Does the project take place in the same location/footprint/trench used before, or in a previously undisturbed area?
 - Yes, same footprint.
- Would the project involve ground disturbance (cut or fill)? If so, how many cubic yards and where will materials be deposited (both temporarily and permanently)? If fill materials are taken, identify the specific site fill taken from and if the materials are native to the park. How would fill be “stored”?
 - No.
- How much excavation would be necessary (quantify by width, length, depth, cubic feet, number or lines, etc.)
 - None.
- Would the proposal involve work in or near a known archeological site or other historic property?
 - No, this proposal involves no additional work at this historic property, other than the potential removal of any items listed under Stipulation V that have not yet been removed, if park staff determine it is safe and accessible to do so.
- Would a staging area be required? If so, identify staging area(s), include map, what type of materials and/or equipment and for how long? What would be the estimated square footage of the staging area?
 - No.
- How/where would construction debris be disposed of?
 - No construction debris would be produced.
- How much surface area would be disturbed, cleared, or denuded of vegetation (quantify by square footage, # of trees removed, etc.)
 - None.

- Would the project involve any geologic or hydrologic features/alter stream courses, surface or ground water flow?
 - Under this alternative the chalet could be taken by the Quinault River and may cause changes in water quality, hydrology, and streamflow characteristics.
- Would the proposal involve structures, fill, or discharge into water (example: bridge crossing, boardwalk, gravel, culverts, etc.)?
 - No.
- Would the proposal affect water quality or quantity?
 - Under this alternative the chalet could be taken by the Quinault River and may cause changes in water quality, hydrology, and streamflow characteristics.
- What changes would occur in land/facility use?
 - None. The facility is currently closed to public and administrative use and would continue to be closed to public and administrative use.
- What changes would occur to traffic flow or visitor circulation?
 - None.
- Would the proposal require aerial operations?
 - No.
- Would the proposal alter visitor services, activities, or experiences?
 - Under this alternative the chalet would remain on the steel I-beams which could have an adverse impact on the visitor experience due to seeing a historic structure, in designated wilderness, atop steel I-beams. Also, the chalet could be taken by the Quinault River and may cause adverse visitor experiences due to the loss of a historic structure and the presence of steel I-beams and other building components in a natural river system within the wilderness. Some visitors may not support the continued existence of the chalet and would prefer to see it removed, however, the aesthetic of seeing the chalet resting within the river until it can be removed safely, as well as possibly recognizing the potential impacts it could cause to federally threatened fish species, bull trout critical habitat, and on the hydrology and streamflow characteristics would still likely have an adverse effect on the experience of these visitors.
- Where would the action take place?
 - No action would take place.
- When would the action take place?
 - No action would take place.
- What design and standards would apply?
 - None.
- What methods, tools and techniques would be used?
 - Hand tools would be used to salvage any additional historic materials listed under Stipulation V of the 2014 MOA. The woodstove would be disassembled and packed out.
- How long would it take to complete the action?
 - There would be no action.
- What mitigation would be taken to minimize action impacts on park resources and values, and wilderness resources and character (where applicable)?
 - Remove, to the extent possible, any remaining pieces of historic fabric identified in the 2014 MOA.

Alternative B: Dismantle and remove the chalet.

- What is proposed?
 - Under Alternative B, the chalet would be dismantled and removed. Large, heavy materials would be removed by helicopter such as the steel I-beams, cribbing, dimensional lumber, chimney, and stove, as well as painted and non-native materials. The 48-ton building was constructed primarily from native materials. Because of the large amount of these materials, some may be placed in small piles and burned onsite, and smaller portions would be removed by helicopter. The remainder of the materials would be left to decompose naturally. A Type 3 helicopter would be used to bring in tools and equipment and a Type 2 helicopter would be needed to fly out materials, the I-beams, and equipment. The Type 3 helicopter would be

utilized during the summer (nesting) season to reduce potential effects on marbled murrelets and northern spotted owls. The larger, Type 2 helicopter would be utilized outside of murrelet and spotted owl nesting season to reduce the total number of flights that would otherwise occur. Overall, a maximum of 99 helicopter turns (approximately 11-12 days/80 hours of helicopter use) would be necessary. Equipment would include hydraulic jacks for lifting the chalet, various power tools (such as drills and reciprocating saws) for dismantling the internal temporary walls and shoring that provided rigidity in the chalet during the move in 2014, and a small suitcase generator would be required for power tool use, or to charge battery-operated tools. Other tools would include scaffolding, ladders, chainsaws, and rigging gear (such as a grip hoist, Lewis wrench and gas-powered wrenches).

- Most of the chalet's important historic materials have already been removed from the building for safekeeping. Those that remain may be salvaged for the park's museum collections. The proposed action would be implemented over one year (approximately 24-26 weeks) by an NPS crew of 8 plus, intermittently, 1-2 packers and a string of 8 stock. Bunch Field, in the Quinault area, would be used as a helicopter staging area. Temporary closures would occur for trails and camp areas within the flight zone and Enchanted Valley during helicopter use. Work would not occur in the Quinault River.
- Does the proposed action involve new construction or repair/rehab to existing structures/utilities/assets?
 - No new construction, chalet removal instead.
- Does the project take place in the same location/footprint/trench used before, or in a previously undisturbed area?
 - Yes, the chalet would be removed from its current location.
- Would the project involve ground disturbance (cut or fill)? If so, how many cubic yards and where would materials be deposited (both temporarily and permanently)? If fill materials are taken, identify the specific site fill taken from and if the materials are native to the park. How would fill be "stored"?
 - No.
- How much excavation would be necessary (quantify by width, length, depth, cubic feet, number of lines, etc.)?
 - None.
- Would the proposal involve work in or near a known archeological site or other historic property?
 - Yes, the chalet is a historic property. There could be an archeological site present in the area due to the location/characteristics of the site.
- Would a staging area be required? If so, identify staging area(s), include map, what type of materials and/or equipment and for how long? What would be the estimated square footage of the staging area?
 - Approximately one 64 square foot staging area would be utilized to store crew gear/tools and eight 900 square foot staging areas would be used to temporarily place larger building material as the chalet is being deconstructed. All nine staging areas would be located within 120' of the chalet and would be utilized for the duration of the project. At the end of the project the material from the eight larger staging areas would be either flown out or the native material would be dispersed around the valley.
 - Staging would mainly occur outside of wilderness, though there would need to be staging on-site during deconstruction and until materials are flown out. Materials would be flown out during the same 24- to 26-week timeframe for dismantling and removal, however, given that work may occur during marbled murrelet nesting season, helicopter flights for material removal could occur after September 23rd depending on weather.
 - Helicopter staging would be located at Bunch Field in the Quinault frontcountry.
- How/where would construction debris be disposed of?
 - Properly, per OSHA standards, and outside of wilderness in either a park frontcountry facility or non-park facility.
- How much surface area would be disturbed, cleared, or denuded of vegetation (quantify by square footage, # of trees removed, etc.)?
 - None.
- Would the project involve any geologic or hydrologic features/alter stream courses, surface or ground water flow?
 - No.

- Would the proposal involve structures, fill, or discharge into water (example: bridge crossing, boardwalk, gravel, culverts, etc.)?
 - No.
- Would the proposal affect water quality or quantity?
 - No.
- What changes would occur in land/facility use?
 - None. The chalet is currently not in use and would be removed.
- What changes would occur to traffic flow or visitor circulation?
 - Visitors would be routed away from helicopter operations. Temporary closures would occur for trails and camp areas within the flight zone and the Enchanted Valley during helicopter use.
- Would the proposal require aerial operations?
 - Yes. A Type 3 helicopter would be needed to bring in tools and equipment and to fly out materials, the I-beams, tools, and equipment. This would require a maximum of 99 helicopter turns (approximately 11-12 days/80 hours of helicopter use) over one year (approximately 24-26 weeks). Equipment would include hydraulic jacks for lifting the building, various cordless power tools (such as cordless drills and sawzalls) for dismantling the internal temporary walls and shoring that provided rigidity in the structure during the move in 2014, and a small suitcase generator would be necessary for charging the cordless tools. Materials representing the historic fabric of the chalet may be salvaged for the collections. The proposed action would be implemented over one year (approximately 24-26 weeks) and helicopter flights would occur outside of marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl nesting seasons to the extent practicable. Project crews would hike to/from Enchanted Valley. Bunch Field, in the Quinault frontcountry, would be used as a helicopter staging area.
- Would the proposal alter visitor services, activities, or experiences?
 - Under this alternative the chalet would be removed. Some visitors would like to see the chalet remain within the Enchanted Valley and others would prefer to see it removed.
 - Project crews and pack stock would camp in the Enchanted Valley camping area over the 24-26 weeks of the project period, reducing camping options for visitors and increasing crowding.
- Where would the action take place?
 - On the river terrace within the Enchanted Valley where the chalet currently rests.
- When would the action take place?
 - Summer and fall, and as funding, staffing, and other resources allow.
- What design and standards would apply?
 - N/A
- What methods, tools and techniques would be used?
 - Use of pack stock and a helicopter.
 - Equipment would include hand-powered hydraulic jacks and grip hoist to assist with safely dismantling the building. Battery operated and corded tools such as sawzall, grinder, rotary hammer and drill for dismantling the chimney, interior / exterior structural supports and wall logs. A small gas-powered suitcase generator would be necessary for charging and/or running cordless tools. A gas-powered chainsaw, winch and drill would be use to assist with dismantling the larger timbers and hand powered grip hoists would be used to move larger building members.
- How long would it take to complete the action?
 - Approximately 24-26 weeks.
- What mitigation measures would be taken to minimize action impacts on park resources and values, and wilderness resources and character (where applicable)?
 - Remove, to the extent possible, any remaining pieces of historic fabric identified in the 2014 MOA.
 - Impacts on wilderness character would be considered and minimized throughout the operation. For each component of the project, the minimum tool specific for that action would be selected for use.
 - Use the smallest, quietest helicopter practicable.
 - Conduct work outside of critical periods for the specific species when possible.

- Implement erosion control measures, minimize discharge to water bodies, and regularly inspect equipment for leaks of petroleum and other chemicals to prevent water pollution.
- Implement standard noise abatement measures during the project, including: scheduling to minimize impacts in noise-sensitive areas, using the best available noise control techniques wherever feasible, minimizing the use of motorized equipment, using hydraulically or electrically powered tools when feasible, and locating stationary noise sources as far from sensitive uses as possible.
- Project crews would practice LNT principles, including proper methods for food storage and human waste disposal. Personnel would camp in established campsites.
- Information about potential closures/delay for visitors due to flights would be provided to visitors through the Wilderness Information Center as well as other information outlets.

Alternative C: Relocate the chalet to another location on the terrace.

- What is proposed?
 - Under Alternative C, the chalet would be moved approximately 250 feet to another location on the surrounding terrace. The move would take place in two 125-foot increments over a 1- to 2-year period. The 2017 Site Flood Hazards Report (NPS 2017) suggests the site with the greatest chance for long term stability would be as close to the eastern valley-side terrace wall as is practical. The precise location would be selected to minimize damage to vegetation, particularly trees. This includes live, dead, fallen, and standing trees. At the new location the chalet would be placed on a new foundation and the chimney would be repaired. The foundation would be constructed of sustainable materials such as concrete and rock. Approximately 12 cubic yards of cement would be required and it may be possible to harvest some or all of the rock onsite. In this alternative, if hazards such as avalanche, fire, flooding, or treefall should damage or threaten the chalet, no action would be taken to relocate the structure again. If the river moves within 30 feet of the chalet's new location the building would be dismantled and removed as described in alternative B. This would be done only if park staff determine it is safe to do so.
 - The mechanism for moving the chalet would be similar to the process used to relocate the building in 2014. The relocation would be accomplished using hydraulic lifts, non-toxic soap, and the steel I-beams on which the chalet currently rests. The building would be moved in a direct line (it may be angled slightly to the right/east from its longest edge opposite the river toward the northeast) to the valley wall. The path the building would travel is located in the "area of interest" defined by the Site Flood Hazards survey (see figure 2 on page 16 in EA). Approximately 12 cottonwood or alder trees of up to 72" in diameter would be removed. Some minor leveling of the landscape would be done by hand.
 - A Type 3 helicopter would be used to fly support materials such as additional cribbing, hydraulic jacks for lifting the chalet, various power tools such as drills, and reciprocating saws and a small suitcase generator for power tool use, or to charge battery-operated tools. A maximum of 60 helicopter turns (approximately 7 days/50 hours of helicopter use) would transport these materials in and out of the work site. Between year one and year two, some of this equipment would be stored onsite in the chalet or in the Knaack boxes that are currently on location.
 - The move would take 2 to 3 days each year and require the support of a 3-person crew, one string of 8 stock, and a packer. Construction of the new foundation would require 7 NPS staff, one packer, and one string of 8 stock, for 6-8 weeks in one season. Temporary closures would occur for trail and camp areas within the flight zone and Enchanted Valley during helicopter use. Bunch Field would be used as a helicopter staging area. This action would occur over one summer season (6-8 weeks).
 - The chalet would require periodic maintenance that would be completed in accordance with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and within all applicable wilderness and historic preservation laws. Maintenance activities would be completed with traditional hand tools and stock support. A portion of the chalet may be designated an emergency shelter. The chalet may also be used administratively.
- Does the proposed action involve new construction or repair/rehab to existing structures/utilities/assets?

- Periodic maintenance activities would be conducted as the chalet, in part, may be used for administrative purposes and/or as an emergency shelter. Work would be conducted in accordance with the *Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* and within all applicable wilderness and historic preservation laws.
- Does the project take place in the same location/footprint/trench used before, or in a previously undisturbed area?
 - The chalet would be moved approximately 250 feet from its current location. The new location is previously undisturbed.
- Would the project involve ground disturbance (cut or fill)? If so, how many cubic yards and where would materials be deposited (both temporarily and permanently)? If fill materials are taken, identify the specific site fill taken from and if the materials are native to the park. How would fill be "stored"?
 - Yes. The landscape may need to be leveled along the path on which the chalet would be moved as well as at its final resting place. Approximately 12 trees may need to be removed.
- How much excavation would be necessary (quantify by width, length, depth, cubic feet, number or lines, etc.)?
 - Approximately 500' of disturbance (250' x 2 sides of the building to level rollers) at approximately 18" wide by an average of 10" deep.
- Would the proposal involve work in or near a known archeological site or other historic property?
 - Yes, the chalet is a historic property.
- Would a staging area be required? If so, identify staging area(s), include map, what type of materials and/or equipment and for how long? What would be the estimated square footage of the staging area?
 - Approximately six 64 square foot staging areas would be utilized to store crew gear, tools, cribbing, blocking, framing and foundation material such as rock and/or cement in preparation to move the chalet and construct the new foundation. All six staging areas would be located within 40' of the chalet and/or its new location and be utilized for the duration of the project.
 - Helicopter staging would occur at Bunch Field in the Quinault frontcountry.
- How/where would construction debris be disposed of?
 - Natural materials could be dispersed in the area, however, other construction debris would be disposed of properly, per OSHA standards, and outside of wilderness in either a park frontcountry facility or non-park facility.
- How much surface area would be disturbed, cleared, or denuded of vegetation (quantify by square footage, # of trees removed, etc.)?
 - There would need to be removal of approximately 12 mature alder or cottonwood trees ranging up to approximately 72" in diameter, though only one or two at or near this size may be removed. Some ground level vegetation may also need to be cleared.
- Would the project involve any geologic or hydrologic features/alter stream courses, surface or ground water flow?
 - Under this alternative the chalet could be taken by the Quinault River and may cause changes in water quality, hydrology, and streamflow characteristics.
- Would the proposal involve structures, fill, or discharge into water (example: bridge crossing, boardwalk, gravel, culverts, etc.)?
 - Under this alternative the chalet could be taken by the Quinault River.
- Would the proposal affect water quality or quantity?
 - Under this alternative the chalet could be taken by the Quinault River and may cause changes in water quality, hydrology, and streamflow characteristics.
- What changes would occur in land/facility use?
 - Visitors would no longer be able to camp in the area proposed for relocation. A portion of the chalet may be open for public use as an emergency shelter. The chalet may also be open for administrative use.
- What changes would occur to traffic flow or visitor circulation?
 - Visitors would be routed away from helicopter operations. Temporary closures would occur for trails and camp areas within the flight zone and the Enchanted Valley during helicopter use.
- Would the proposal require aerial operations?
 - Yes. Helicopters would not be used in moving the chalet, however, additional cribbing for a new foundation may need to be brought in and would require the use of a helicopter. Also, the I-

beams would be removed via helicopter once the chalet is moved and placed on a new foundation. A Type 3 helicopter would be needed to bring in tools and equipment and to fly out materials, the I-beams, tools, and equipment. This would require a maximum of 60 helicopter turns (approximately 7 days/50 hours of helicopter use) over 6-8 weeks. Equipment would include hydraulic jacks for lifting the chalet, various cordless power tools (such as cordless drills and sawzalls) for dismantling the internal temporary walls and shoring that provided rigidity in the chalet during the move in 2014, and a small suitcase generator would be necessary for charging the cordless tools. Project crews would hike to/from Enchanted Valley. Bunch Field, in the Quinault frontcountry, would be used as a helicopter staging area.

- Would the proposal alter visitor services, activities, or experiences?
 - Under this alternative the chalet could be taken by the Quinault River. Some visitors may not support the continued existence of the chalet and would prefer to see it removed. The aesthetic of seeing the chalet resting within the river until it can be removed safely, as well as possibly recognizing the potential impacts it could cause to federally threatened fish species, bull trout critical habitat, and on the hydrology and streamflow characteristics would also likely have an adverse effect on the experience of these visitors. Helicopters would be utilized to bring in necessary equipment and materials to construct the new foundation and to remove the I-beams, which would require temporary area closures and would cause noise disturbance.
 - Project crews and pack stock would camp in the Enchanted Valley camping area over the 6-8 weeks of the project period, reducing camping options for visitors and increasing crowding.
- Where would the action take place?
 - On the river terrace within the Enchanted Valley between where chalet currently rests to the location 250 feet away where it may be moved.
- When would the action take place?
 - Summer and fall, and as funding, staffing, and other resources allow.
- What design and standards would apply?
 - N/A
- What methods, tools and techniques would be used?
 - Use of pack stock and a helicopter.
 - Equipment would include hand-powered hydraulic jacks and grip hoist to assist with safely dismantling and re-assembling the building. Battery operated and corded tools such as sawzall, grinder, rotary hammer and drill for dismantling the chimney, interior/exterior structural supports and wall logs. A small gas-powered suitcase generator would be necessary for charging and/or running cordless tools. A gas-powered chainsaw, winch, and drill would be use to assist with dismantling the larger timbers and hand powered grip hoists would be used to move larger building members. Additionally, a gas-powered cement mixer would be used to mix cement for the new foundation.
- How long would it take to complete the action?
 - Approximately 6-8 weeks
- What mitigation measures would be taken to minimize action impacts on park resources and values, and wilderness resources and character (where applicable)?
 - Impacts on wilderness character would be considered and minimized throughout the operation. For each component of the project, the minimum tool specific for that action would be selected for use.
 - Use the smallest, quietest helicopter practicable.
 - Locate and design facilities/actions/operations to avoid or minimize the removal of rare, threatened, and endangered species habitat. If avoidance is infeasible, minimize and compensate for adverse effects as appropriate and in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies.
 - Conduct work outside of critical periods for the specific species when possible.
 - For projects in or near streams, employ appropriate best management practices.
 - Protect and preserve critical habitat features, such as nest trees, whenever possible.
 - Implement erosion control measures (such as silt fencing, as necessary), minimize discharge to water bodies, and regularly inspect equipment for leaks of petroleum and other chemicals to prevent water pollution.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement standard noise abatement measures during the project, including: scheduling to minimize impacts in noise-sensitive areas, using the best available noise control techniques wherever feasible, minimizing the use of motorized equipment, using hydraulically or electrically powered tools when feasible, and locating stationary noise sources as far from sensitive uses as possible. ○ Project crews would practice LNT principles, including proper methods for food storage and human waste disposal. Personnel would camp in established campsites. ○ Information about potential closures/delay for visitors due to flights would be provided to visitors through the Wilderness Information Center as well as other information outlets.

9	Evaluate the impacts of each alternative	<p>Potential impacts to evaluate under <u>each</u> alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilderness character effects • Effects on natural resources • Cultural resources considerations • Social/recreational/experiential effects • Societal/political effects • Health/safety concerns • Economic/timing/sustainability considerations
---	--	--

Alternative A: No action – The chalet would remain in its current location atop the steel I-beams.

Wilderness character effects (untrammled, natural, undeveloped, solitude or a primitive & unconfined type of recreation)

Positive effects:

- Untrammled: There would be no direct modifications made to the river or riverbank, and no cutting of trees to facilitate the moving of the chalet.
- Natural: Under this alternative no work would be conducted on the chalet, thus there would be little crew presence or helicopter and motorized tool use to disturb wildlife or impact the natural soundscape until, or if, the chalet is salvaged from the river if park staff determine it is safe, accessible, and economically feasible to do so.
- Undeveloped: The chalet may erode into the river and eventually break up and be washed down river and/or decompose and the development no longer be present in the wilderness (though the I-beams would remain). No work is proposed so there would be no use of motorized equipment or mechanical transport until, or if, the chalet could be salvaged from the river if park staff determine it is safe, accessible, and economically feasible to do so.
- Solitude or a Primitive & Unconfined Type of Recreation: There would be no helicopter use under this alternative and therefore no area and trail closures until, or if, the chalet could be salvaged from the river if park staff determine it is safe, accessible, and economically feasible to do so. Additionally, the lack of project crew presence and helicopter and equipment use would mean there would be more of a sense of remoteness from sights and sounds of human activity (though the Enchanted Valley is a popular backpacking camp area). The chalet would not be available for visitor emergency use, thus more self-reliant recreation would be required.
- Other features of value (American Indian Resources): American Indian resources (archeological and ethnographic resources), associated with Olympic Peninsula tribes represent the other features of value within the park's wilderness. Small scale archeological survey projects associated with park operations have not turned up pre-contact archeological resources in the valley. Due to the dynamic nature of the Quinault River, there appears to be very little potential for encountering intact, pre-contact archeological resources during proposed activities associated with the alternatives.

Negative effects:

- Untrammled: None.
- Natural: The chalet would remain in its current location until it, along with the steel I-beams, erodes into the river. It is unclear whether the chalet would collapse, remain intact, or if/when removal would occur. This could have negative effects on fish, fish habitat, water quality (increased turbidity), and may lead to

unnatural shifts in channel migration and streamflow characteristics. This alternative has the most imminent outcome for the chalet eroding into the river.

- **Undeveloped:** The chalet would remain either on the terrace or may erode into the river. If it erodes into the river it is unclear whether it would collapse, remain intact, and if/when removal would occur. The chalet, including the I-beams, could remain within the river for an indefinite period of time.
- **Solitude or a Primitive & Unconfined Type of Recreation:** Other features of value (American Indian Resources): The streams within the Enchanted Valley are associated with treaty fishing rights. Therefore, these streams are ethnographic resources for the tribes associated with this treaty. If the chalet is taken by the river, the other features of value quality of wilderness character would experience negative effects due to potential disruptions to fish, fish habitat, and spawning due to increased turbidity, direct impact (such as the structure landing on fish, redds, and either damaging or occupying fish habitat), and creating other unnatural changes in channel migration and streamflow characteristics.

Effects on natural resources

Positive effects: Under this alternative there would be no resource modification for the relocation or protection of the chalet so no resulting impacts on natural resources from such actions. See also, "Positive effects" on the natural quality of wilderness character.

Negative effects: See also, "Negative effects" on the natural quality of wilderness character.

Cultural resources considerations

Positive effects: The chalet would remain in its current location until it erodes into the river and would maintain its National Register listing status until that time.

Negative effects: The chalet would eventually erode into the river, at which time it would lose its listing status.

Social/recreational/experiential effects

Positive effects: Some of the public would be happy for the chalet to remain in place. Some may be happy for the chalet to eventually erode into the river so that it would ultimately be gone, though there would be aesthetic and resource impacts in the meantime. No work would be conducted so there would be little crew presence or helicopter and motorized tool use and no trail or area closures for helicopter flights, to impact visitors' wilderness experience, until, or if, park staff determine that it is safe, accessible, and economically feasible to remove the chalet from the river.

Negative effects: Some visitors would prefer to see the chalet moved to another location where it would no longer be threatened by the river. Some may wish to see the chalet removed, and while it may erode into the river, visitors would likely not want to see it in the river.

Societal/political effects

Positive effects: Some of the public would be happy for the chalet to remain in place. Some may be happy for the chalet to eventually erode into the river so that it would ultimately be gone, though there would be aesthetic and resource impacts in the meantime.

Negative effects: Some of the public would prefer for the chalet to be moved to another location where it would no longer be threatened by the river. Some of the public may wish for the chalet to be removed entirely, and while it may erode into the river, would likely not want to see it in the river. Public outcry over the potential, eventual loss of the chalet may lead to political pressure and legislation for permanent protection of the structure within the Enchanted Valley. If this were to occur, it would require an exorbitant amount of funding to maintain the chalet as well as to rebuild it, possibly repeatedly, if/when it erodes into the river given the terrace is anticipated to erode away entirely within 10-20 years, or if/when it is damaged by avalanches or debris flows. This would require diversion of funding from other park programs and pertinent needs, if the funding is not appropriated.

Health/safety concerns

Positive effects: There would not be crews working at the site, and therefore staff would not be exposed to the inherent risk involved in project work, especially helicopter use.

Negative effects: The chalet would remain in place with the I-beams underneath it. The chalet has become an attractive nuisance with staff reports of visitors repeatedly crawling underneath it or breaking into it. These actions would be likely to continue and could present safety issues if the chalet were to collapse. Also, the chalet may eventually erode into the river. It is unclear whether the chalet would remain intact or collapse, how far down the river would it travel, etc. This would present additional safety concerns regarding visitors attempting to access the chalet while it is in the river.

Economic/timing/sustainability considerations

Positive effects: No funding would be expended on the chalet, and since there are no actions associated with this alternative there would be no timing or sustainability issues. There's no exhibited need for the chalet for visitor or administrative use within the wilderness.

Negative effects: Under this alternative the chalet would require eventual river removal, if park staff determine it is safe, accessible, and economically feasible to do so, rather than the chalet's removal being addressed more efficiently while it is on land.

Alternative B: Dismantle and remove the chalet.

Wilderness character effects (untrammeled, natural, undeveloped, solitude or a primitive & unconfined type of recreation)

Positive effects:

- Untrammeled: There would be no direct modifications made to the river or riverbank, and no cutting of trees to facilitate the moving of the chalet.
- Natural: The chalet structure and the cribbing, chimney, I-beams and other non-natural materials would be removed from the wilderness so as to not erode into the river and thus not cause negative effects on fish, fish habitat, water quality, channel migration, and streamflow characteristics. Dismantling the chalet would occur in summer so that much, if not all, of the helicopter use would occur following spotted owl and marbled murrelet nesting season. Helicopter noise would be somewhat mitigated by threshold distances and timing. If some of the natural chalet materials are burned or dispersed in the woods there would be less helicopter flights necessary for chalet materials' removal, reducing helicopter noise effects on wildlife and the natural soundscape. Lighter materials, tools, equipment would be packed out by staff or pack stock rather than by helicopter transport also reducing noise impacts.
- Undeveloped: The chalet, a development, would be removed from the wilderness. There would be no need for future helicopter flights to help facilitate removal of the chalet from the river, nor to provide maintenance and upkeep of the chalet.
- Solitude or a Primitive & Unconfined Type of Recreation: The chalet would not be available for visitor emergency use, thus more self-reliant recreation would be required.
- Other features of value (American Indian Resources): Small scale archeological survey projects associated with park operations have not turned up pre-contact archeological resources in the valley. Due to the dynamic nature of the Quinault River, there appears to be very little potential for encountering intact, pre-contact archeological resources during proposed activities associated with the alternatives. Under this alternative, the chalet would be dismantled and removed so there would be no impacts on ethnographic resources since the chalet would not be taken by the Quinault River.

Negative effects:

- Untrammeled: None
- Natural: There would be temporary noise disturbances on wildlife due to helicopter use, use of tools and equipment, and staff presence at the site and on the trails (for 24-26 weeks). This noise would also result in impacts to the natural soundscape. Some of the natural materials may be burned, rather than flown out or dispersed in the woods, generating smoke that would affect air quality. There would be

some impacts on vegetation from the one 64 sq. ft. and the eight 900 sq. ft. staging areas, however the vegetation disturbed would most likely be exotic grasses.

- Undeveloped: Motorized tools and helicopters would be used under this alternative (up to three times as many flights as alternative C).
- Solitude or a Primitive & Unconfined Type of Recreation: There may be temporary area closures during helicopter use. There would also be an increase in staff presence and related noise disturbance on trails and in the Enchanted Valley. There would also be noise disturbances from the use of helicopters and various tools and equipment.
- Other features of value (American Indian Resources): None

Effects on natural resources

Positive effects: Under this alternative there would be no resource modification for the relocation or protection of the chalet and the area would be allowed to return to natural conditions. See also, "Positive effects" on the natural quality of wilderness character.

Negative effects: See, "Negative effects" on the natural quality of wilderness character.

Cultural resources considerations

Positive effects: Under this alternative, the chalet would be dismantled and removed so there would be no impacts on ethnographic resources since the chalet would not be taken by the Quinault River.

Negative effects: The chalet would be removed and would lose its National Register listing status.

Social/recreational/experiential effects

Positive effects: Some visitors would be pleased to see the chalet removed and this portion of the wilderness no longer have the development present.

Negative effects: Some visitors would prefer for the chalet to remain within the Enchanted Valley in perpetuity. Project crews and pack stock would camp in the Enchanted Valley camping area over the 24-26 weeks of the project period, reducing camping options for visitors and increasing crowding.

Societal/political effects

Positive effects: Some of the public would be happy to see the chalet removed and this portion of the wilderness restored to natural conditions. Some would be happy knowing that funding would not be directed toward the indefinite maintenance and preservation of a structure that was built in a floodplain on river terrace unconsolidated fill, which is anticipated to erode away entirely within 10-20 years.

Negative effects: Some of the public would prefer to see the chalet either remain where it is within the Enchanted Valley or moved to another location where it would no longer be threatened by the river. Public outcry over removal of the chalet may lead to political pressure and legislation for permanent protection of the chalet within the Enchanted Valley. If this were to occur, it would require an exorbitant amount of funding to maintain the chalet as well as to rebuild it, possibly repeatedly, if/when it erodes into the river given the terrace is anticipated to erode away entirely within 10-20 years or if/when it is damaged by avalanches or debris flows. This would require diversion of funding from other park programs and pertinent needs, if the funding is not appropriated.

Health/safety concerns

Positive effects: The removal of the chalet would essentially remove an attractive nuisance from the Enchanted Valley given staff reports of visitors repeatedly crawling under it or breaking into it.

Negative effects: Crews would be hiking to/from and working on the project and therefore would be exposed to the inherent risk involved in wilderness travel, project work, and helicopter use.

Economic/timing/sustainability considerations

Positive effects: While this alternative would be very costly, over the long-term there would be no additional expenditures on maintenance or preservation activities on the chalet.

Negative effects: The alternative itself is the least costly of all the alternatives presented in this MRA and related EA. It is unclear if or when the park would acquire the funding to dismantle and remove the chalet.

Alternative C: Relocate the chalet to another location on the terrace.

Wilderness character effects (untrammelled, natural, undeveloped, solitude or a primitive & unconfined type of recreation)

Positive effects:

- Untrammelled: There would be no direct modifications made to the river or riverbank. No trees would be removed to improve the view at the new chalet location.
- Natural: There would be a much longer timeframe likely under this alternative before the chalet would erode into the river disrupting natural conditions. If/when the chalet erodes into the river, the area upon which it currently resides could return to natural conditions. Lighter materials, tools, equipment would be packed out by staff or pack stock rather than by helicopter transport, reducing helicopter noise effects on wildlife and the natural soundscape. Helicopter noise would be somewhat mitigated by threshold distances and timing.
- Undeveloped: Periodic maintenance activities conducted on the relocated structure would be limited to those that do not require helicopter or chainsaw use, nor the use of any other motorized equipment or motorized or mechanized transport. The chalet may erode into the river, and eventually break up and be washed down river and/or decompose and no longer be present in the wilderness.
- Solitude or a Primitive & Unconfined Type of Recreation: None.
- Other features of value (American Indian Resources): Small scale archeological survey projects associated with park operations have not turned up pre-contact archeological resources in the valley. Due to the dynamic nature of the Quinault River, there appears to be very little potential for encountering intact, pre-contact archeological resources during proposed activities associated with the alternatives.

Negative effects:

- Untrammelled: Approximately 12 trees would be cut to facilitate the moving of the chalet.
- Natural: Moving the structure to a new location would require some landscape modifications, including the removal of approximately 12 mature cottonwood and alder trees, ranging up to approximately 72" in diameter. There would be approximately 500' of soil disturbance (250' x 2 sides of the building to level rollers) at approximately 18" wide by an average of 10" deep on the chalet's relocation route. If/when the chalet erodes into the river it is unclear whether it would collapse, remain intact, or if/when removal would occur. If it does erode into the river, this could cause disruption to fish, fish habitat, and spawning due to increased turbidity, direct impact (such as the structure landing on fish, redds, and either damaging or occupying fish habitat), and creating other unnatural shifts in channel migration and streamflow characteristics. There would also be temporary noise disturbances on wildlife due to helicopter use, use of tools and equipment, and staff presence at the site and on the trails (for 6-8 weeks). This noise would also result in impacts to the natural soundscape. Helicopter use would occur during spotted owl and marbled murrelet nesting season. There would be some impacts on vegetation from the six 64 sq. ft. staging areas, though some of the vegetation disturbed would most likely be exotic grasses. Rock, for the foundation, may be harvested onsite from the exposed river terrace and dry gravel bars which, though unlikely, could result in additional impacts.
- Undeveloped: The chalet would be retained in wilderness, and a new foundation of cement and rock would be constructed. The chalet would eventually erode into the river, however it would remain in the new location longer than in its current location under alternatives A and B. If/when it erodes into the river it is unclear whether it would collapse, remain intact, and if/when removal would occur. The chalet could remain within the river for an indefinite period of time. Motorized tools and helicopters would be used under this alternative.
- Solitude or a Primitive & Unconfined Type of Recreation: There may be temporary area closures during helicopter use. There would also be an increase in staff and contractor presence and related noise disturbance on trails and in the Enchanted Valley. There would also be noise disturbances from the use

of helicopters and various tools and equipment. A portion of the chalet would be available for visitor emergency use, thus less self-reliant recreation would be required.

- Other features of value (American Indian Resources): If the chalet is taken by the river, the other features of value quality of wilderness character would experience negative effects due to potential disruptions to fish, fish habitat, and spawning due to increased turbidity, direct impact (such as the chalet landing on fish, redds, and either damaging or occupying fish habitat), and creating other unnatural changes in channel migration and streamflow characteristics.

Effects on natural resources

Positive effects: Under this alternative the area where the chalet currently resides would be allowed to return to natural conditions. See also, "Positive effects" on the natural quality of wilderness character.

Negative effects: See, "Negative effects" on the natural quality of wilderness character.

Cultural resources considerations

Positive effects: The chalet would remain within the Enchanted Valley on the river terrace, until it erodes into the river. This alternative provides the greatest potential for the longest survival of the chalet on the terrace (10-20 years per the Site Flood Hazards report).

Negative effects: The chalet's move to the eastern valley wall would increase its exposure to avalanches and alluvial processes. The chalet would eventually erode into the river, at which time it would lose its National Register listing status. If the chalet is taken by the river, the other features of value quality of wilderness character would experience negative effects due to potential disruptions to fish, fish habitat, and spawning due to increased turbidity, direct impact (such as the structure landing on fish, redds, and either damaging or occupying fish habitat), and creating other unnatural changes in channel migration and streamflow characteristics.

Social/recreational/experiential effects

Positive effects: Some visitors would be happy to see the chalet remain within the valley for as long as possible. Some may be happy to see the chalet eventually erode into the river despite the aesthetic and resource impacts this would have.

Negative effects: Some visitors would prefer to see the chalet moved to a location where it would no longer be threatened by the river in perpetuity. Some may wish to see the chalet removed entirely, and while it may eventually erode into the river, visitors would likely not want to see it in the river. Project crews and pack stock would camp in the Enchanted Valley camping area over the 6-8 weeks of the project period, reducing camping options for visitors and increasing crowding.

Societal/political effects

Positive effects: Some of the public would be happy to see the chalet remain within the valley for as long as possible. Some may be happy to see the chalet eventually erode into the river despite the aesthetic and resource impacts this would have.

Negative effects: Some of the public would prefer to see the chalet moved to another location where it would no longer be threatened by the river. Some may wish to see the chalet removed entirely, and while it may eventually erode into the river, visitors would likely not want to see it in the river. Public outcry over the chalet may lead to political pressure and legislation for permanent protection of the chalet within the Enchanted Valley. If this were to occur, it would require an exorbitant amount of funding to maintain the chalet as well as to rebuild it, possibly repeatedly, if/when it erodes into the river given the terrace is anticipated to erode away entirely within 10-20 years or if/when it is damaged by avalanches or debris flows. This would require diversion of funding from other park programs and pertinent needs, if the funding is not appropriated.

Health/safety concerns

Positive effects: The chalet would be moved approximately 250 feet from its current location and placed on a new permanent foundation which would provide additional stability given staff reports of visitors repeatedly crawling underneath it or breaking into it.

Negative effects: The chalet would be moved approximately 250 feet from its current location and placed on a new permanent foundation constructed underneath it. The chalet has become an attractive nuisance with visitors repeatedly crawling under it or breaking into it. These actions would be likely to continue and could present safety issues if the chalet were to collapse. Also, the chalet may eventually erode into the river. It is unclear whether the chalet would remain intact or collapse, how far down the river would it travel, etc. This would present additional safety concerns regarding visitors attempting to access the chalet while it is in the river. Additionally, crews would be hiking to/from and working on the project and therefore would be exposed to the inherent risk involved in wilderness travel, project work, and helicopter use.

Economic/timing/sustainability considerations

Positive effects: The relocation of the chalet approximately 250' from the current riverbank and its placement on a new foundation provide the greatest longevity, and thus sustainability for a standing, usable structure, though according to the 2017 NPS Site Flood Hazards Report the move may extend the life of the chalet only 10-20 years.

Negative effects: Funding would be expended on the chalet for the move and subsequent maintenance activities as needed, though there is no exhibited need for the chalet for visitor or administrative use within the wilderness. Funding would have to be diverted from other park programs and pertinent needs.

10 After approval by the Deputy Superintendent to proceed, update the PPF/MRA with input provided by the Compliance Council and/or the Interdisciplinary Planning Team (IDP) and provide an electronic copy to the Planning and Compliance Office to initiate park internal review and comment.

Comments due by: _____

Wilderness Specialist Comments:

Comments have been incorporated throughout the MRA.

Reviewed by: Ruth Scott **Date** 3-11-19

After the established review period, contact the Planning and Compliance Office to schedule a discussion of your issue at a park Compliance Council meeting to recommend a preferred alternative and complete the review process.

11

Select the alternative that would most effectively resolve the issue while having the least overall adverse impact on park resources & values and wilderness resources, character and the visitor experience

Note: When selecting the preferred alternative for actions in wilderness, the potential disruption of wilderness character and resources will be considered before, and given significantly more weight than, economic efficiency and convenience. If a compromise of wilderness resources or character is unavoidable, only those actions that preserve wilderness character and/or have localized, short-term adverse impacts will be acceptable.

Preferred alternative: B **Dismantle and remove the chalet.**

Describe rationale for selecting this alternative including how it meets minimum requirement guidelines and how impacts to wilderness would be minimized and mitigated (if applicable). Also, describe the safety risks and the preventive/mitigation measures that would be implemented:

Alternative B (dismantle and remove) is selected as the preferred alternative as it has the greatest overall beneficial impacts on wilderness character over the long term. The chalet's removal would eliminate concerns for it to erode into the river and disrupt hydrology and natural streamflow processes, as well as for adverse impacts on bull trout critical habitat and tribal fisheries downstream. There would be no need for additional future flights to address maintenance needs or removal from the river. Some visitors may find their wilderness experience enhanced with the removal of the chalet, others may be adversely affected upon its removal. The area would also be allowed to return to natural conditions. This alternative also has the greatest amount of helicopter use, though this use would occur over approximately 11-12 days over one year.

Mitigation measures include, but are not limited to the following:

- Remove, to the extent possible, any remaining pieces of historic fabric identified in the 2014 MOA.
- Impacts on wilderness character would be considered and minimized throughout the operation. For each component of the project, the minimum tool specific for that action would be selected for use.
- Use the smallest, quietest helicopter practicable.
- Conduct work outside of critical periods for the specific species when possible.
- Implement erosion control measures (such as silt fencing, as necessary), minimize discharge to water bodies, and regularly inspect equipment for leaks of petroleum and other chemicals to prevent water pollution.
- Implement standard noise abatement measures during the project, including: scheduling to minimize impacts in noise-sensitive areas, using the best available noise control techniques wherever feasible, minimizing the use of motorized equipment, using hydraulically or electrically powered tools when feasible, and locating stationary noise sources as far from sensitive uses as possible.
- Project crews would practice LNT principles, including proper methods for food storage and human waste disposal. Personnel would camp in established campsites.
- Information about potential closures/delay for visitors due to flights would be provided to visitors through the Wilderness Information Center as well as other information outlets.

Safety mitigations to reduce safety issues:

- Job Hazard Analyses would be completed before the project and every crew member would be briefed on safely executing the work plan.
- PPE would be worn when working within the immediate project area.
- Park staff conducting helicopter operations would be experienced and have the required training and certification including training in helicopter long-lining and load rigging.
- Trail guards would protect visitors from entering the area during helicopter operations.

Reviewed by: _____ Date _____
Wilderness Specialist

Leadership Team Comments on Preferred Alternative (recommendation to Superintendent for final review and approval)

Administration Division comments/recommended mitigations:

Reviewed by Administrative Officer: _____ **Date** _____

<p>Interpretation Division comments/recommended mitigations:</p> <p>Reviewed by Chief of Interpretation: _____ Date _____</p>
<p>Cultural Resources comments/recommended mitigations (include next steps for compliance with NHPA, other applicable cultural resource law/policy):</p> <p>Reviewed by Section 106 Specialist: _____ Date _____</p>
<p>Visitor and Resource Protection Division comments/recommended mitigations:</p> <p>Reviewed by Chief Ranger: _____ Date _____</p>
<p>Facilities Management Division comments/recommended mitigations:</p> <p>Reviewed by Chief of Facilities Mgmt: _____ Date _____</p>
<p>Natural Resources Division comments/recommended mitigations:</p> <p>T & E Species Determination of Effect (No Effect (NE), Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA), Likely to Adversely Affect (LAA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bull Trout: _____ • Marbled Murrelet: _____ • Northern spotted owl: _____ • Other: _____ <p>Reviewed by Chief of NRM: _____ Date _____</p>
<p><u>Compliance Pathway Determination:</u></p> <p>Categorical Exclusion: _____ EA: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X _____ EIS: _____</p> <p>Recommended by Env. Protection Specialist: _____ Date: _____</p>

Approved by:

Superintendent

Date

Appendix D: Consultation Letters



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, Washington 98362-6798

IN REPLY REFER TO:

1.A.2

July 15, 2016

Reid Nelson
Director, Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
401 F Street NW, Suite 308
Washington, DC 20001-2637

Dear Mr. Nelson,

The National Park Service (NPS) has started public scoping for the development of an environmental assessment (EA) for the final disposition of the Enchanted Valley Chalet (EVC) for Olympic National Park (see Enclosure 1 for more information). The NPS has determined that the proposed project is an undertaking as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.16(y) and is hereby initiating the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act consultation process in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3 for the undertaking. We encourage you to provide us with early input on the undertaking by commenting (electronically at: <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/EVCscoping> or by mail) during the scoping period which ends August 31, 2016.

The EVC is located 13 miles up the East Fork Quinault River from the Graves Creek Trailhead, at an approximate elevation of 2030 feet (619 meters), within the Congressionally-designated Olympic Wilderness. The structure is located on the active floodplain of the East Fork Quinault River. The river has come close to impacting the structure since 2005 and actually undercut the structure in 2014. The structure was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2007 for its association with commercial interests to develop the recreational potential of the Olympic Peninsula's interior mountain wilderness (Criterion A) and because it represents a distinctive method of construction and design on log cabin building (Criterion C).

The park prepared a concise EA and signed a Finding of No Significant Impact for an emergency action to temporarily relocate the EVC in July 2014. The concise EA stated that the NPS would embark on a separate planning and compliance process for the final disposition of the chalet. In August 2014, the NPS executed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regarding the EVC. In September 2014, the NPS hired a local contractor, and the EVC was moved approximately 100 feet from the East Fork Quinault River.

Section 106 consultation will be conducted throughout the EA process and as the alternatives become more fully developed. Enclosure 2 is the list of consulting parties for the undertaking. Please notify us of any additional parties you feel may be interested in participating in these consultations as soon as possible. Our points of contact for this are Liz Gordon (email: elizabeth_gordon@nps.gov or by phone at 808-283-4752) and Dave Conca (email: dave_conca@nps.gov or by phone at 360-565-3053).

Sincerely,



M. Sarah Creachbaum
Superintendent

Enclosures:

- (1) EVC EA Scoping Letter
- (2) EVC Consulting Parties List



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, Washington 98362-6798

IN REPLY REFER TO:

1.A.2

July 15, 2016

Allyson Brooks
State Historic Preservation Officer
Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation
PO Box 48343,
Olympia, WA 98504-8343

Dear Ms. Brooks,

The National Park Service (NPS) has started public scoping for the development of an environmental assessment (EA) for the final disposition of the Enchanted Valley Chalet (EVC) for Olympic National Park (see Enclosure 1 for more information). The NPS has determined that the proposed project is an undertaking as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.16(y) and is hereby initiating the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act consultation process in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3 for the undertaking. We encourage you to provide us with early input on the undertaking by commenting (electronically at: <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/EVCscoping> or by mail) during the scoping period which ends August 31, 2016.

The EVC is located 13 miles up the East Fork Quinault River from the Graves Creek Trailhead, at an approximate elevation of 2030 feet (619 meters), within the Congressionally-designated Olympic Wilderness. The structure is located on the active floodplain of the East Fork Quinault River. The river has come close to impacting the structure since 2005 and actually undercut the structure in 2014. The structure was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2007 for its association with commercial interests to develop the recreational potential of the Olympic Peninsula's interior mountain wilderness (Criterion A) and because it represents a distinctive method of construction and design on log cabin building (Criterion C).

The park prepared a concise EA and signed a Finding of No Significant Impact for an emergency action to temporarily relocate the EVC in July 2014. The concise EA stated that the NPS would embark on a separate planning and compliance process for the final disposition of the chalet. In August 2014, the NPS executed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regarding the EVC. In September 2014, the NPS hired a local contractor, and the EVC was moved approximately 100 feet from the East Fork Quinault River.

Section 106 consultation will be conducted throughout the EA process and as the alternatives become more fully developed. Enclosure 2 is the list of consulting parties for the undertaking. Please notify us of any additional parties you feel may be interested in participating in these consultations as soon as possible. Our points of contact for this are Liz Gordon (email: elizabeth_gordon@nps.gov or by phone at 808-283-4752) and Dave Conca (email: dave_conca@nps.gov or by phone at 360-565-3053).

Sincerely,



M. Sarah Creachbaum
Superintendent

Enclosures:

- (1) EVC EA Scoping Letter
- (2) EVC Consulting Parties List

cc:

Greg Griffith, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Washington State Department of
Archeology and Historic Preservation
Nick Vann, Historical Architect, Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic
Preservation



Allyson Brooks Ph.D., Director
State Historic Preservation Officer

August 24, 2016

Ms. Sarah Creachbaum, Superintendent
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, WA 98362-6798

In future correspondence please refer to:

Project Tracking Code: 2016-08-06064

Property: Enchanted Valley Chalet, Olympic National Park

Re: Environmental Assessment for Final Disposition of the EVC

Dear Superintendent Creachbaum:

Thank you for your letter to the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding the above referenced proposal at Olympic National Park. From your letter, we understand that the National Park Service is initiating development of an environmental assessment (EA) for the final disposition of the Enchanted Valley Chalet, a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places. As a result of our review, we are providing the following comments and recommendations:

- 1) Based upon our review of the alternatives described in your letter, DAHP recommends selection of the "relocation to another location within the Enchanted Valley" alternative.
- 2) We recommend against selection of the No Action, Set Structure in Place and Dismantling and Potential Removal alternatives. These alternatives are seen as resulting in the eventual destruction of the EVC.
- 3) In regard to the list of Consulting Parties on this action, our only recommendation at this time is to add Jeff Monroe of Sequim to the list. Jeff is recommended in view of his high interest and engagement in preserving the EVC. Also, other Olympic Peninsula tribal governments may desire to be consulted on this proposal.

The above comments are based on the information available at the time of this review and on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in conformance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36 CFR 800. Also, we appreciate receiving copies of any correspondence or comments from concerned tribes and other parties that you receive as you consult under the requirements of 36 CFR 800.4(a)(4). Should additional information become available, our assessment may be revised.

Finally, please note that in order to streamline our responses, DAHP requires that all documents related to project reviews be submitted electronically. Correspondence, reports, notices, photos, etc. must now be submitted in PDF or JPG format. For more information about how to submit documents to DAHP please visit: <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/programs/shpo-compliance>. To assist you in conducting a cultural resource survey and inventory effort, DAHP has developed guidelines including requirements for survey reports. You can view or download a copy from our website.

State of Washington • Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation
P.O. Box 48343 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8343 • (360) 586-3065
www.dahp.wa.gov



Ms. Sarah Creachbaum
August 24, 2016
Page Two

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposal. If you have any questions, please contact me at greg.griffith@dahp.wa.gov or 360-586-3073.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Greg Griffith".

Gregory Griffith
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

C: Alexis Barry, Hoh Indian Tribe Cultural Resources
Leilani Chubby, Quinault Nation Cultural Resources
Justine James, Quinault Nation Cultural Resources
Chris Moore, Washington Trust for Historic Preservation
Brian Turner, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Charles Woodruff, Chair, Quileute Nation